

CHURCH HISTORY

Edited by J. H. NICHOLS and L. J. TRINTERUD
with the cooperation of

ROLAND BAINTON (*Divinity School,
Yale University*)

R. PIERCE BEAVER (*Missionary Re-
search Library*)

ROBERT GRANT (*Divinity School,
University of Chicago*)

WINTHROP S. HUDSON (*Colgate-
Rochester Divinity School*)

SIDNEY E. MEAD (*Divinity School,
University of Chicago*)

RAY C. PETRY (*Divinity School, Duke
University*)

MATTHEW SPINKA (*Hartford Theo-
logical Seminary*)

WILHELM PAUCK (*Union Theological
Seminary*)

VOL. XXIV

MARCH, 1955

No. 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

AMERICANIZATION OF KARL AUGUST RAUSCHENBUSCH,
1816-1899

Carl E. Schneider

3

THE VITA APOSTOLICA: DIVERSITY OR DISSENT

Ernest W. McDonnell

15

DENOMINATIONALISM AS A BASIS FOR ECUMENICITY:
A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY CONCEPTION

Winthrop S. Hudson

32

JONATHAN EDWARDS' CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH

Thomas A. Schafer

51

CONTENTS

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS	67
BOOK REVIEWS	70
DE JONGE, DR. M.: <i>The Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs</i>	Robert M. Grant
LOETSCHER, LEFFERTS A.: <i>The Broadening Church: A Study of Theological Issues in the Presbyterian Church Since 1869</i>	H. Keith Markell
DÖRRIES, HERMANN: <i>Das Selbstzeugnis Kaiser Konstantins</i>	Roland H. Bainton
O'MALLEY, E. AUSTIN: <i>Tello and Theotonio, the Twelfth-century Founders of the Monastery of Santa Cruz in Coimbra</i>	Allen Cabaniss
MCDONNELL, ERNEST W.: <i>The Beguines and Beghards in Medieval Culture with special emphasis on the Belgian scene</i>	Ray C. Petry
VON LOEWENICH, WALTHER: <i>Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus</i>	Roland H. Bainton
MCNEILL, JOHN T.: <i>The History and Character of Calvinism</i>	Walter E. Stuermann
CHESTER, ALLAN G.: <i>Hugh Latimer, Apostle to the English</i>	John T. McNeill
KOCHER, PAUL H.: <i>Science and Religion in Elizabethan England</i>	Quirinus Breen
JENKINS, DANIEL T.: <i>Congregationalism: A Restatement</i>	James Gustafson
BRAILS福德, MABEL R.: <i>A Tale of Two Brothers, John and Charles Wesley</i>	Richard Cameron
MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL	82
MINUTES OF THE SOCIETY	83
REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY	84
MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY	85

AMERICANIZATION OF KARL AUGUST RAUSCHENBUSCH, 1816-1899*

CARL E. SCHNEIDER, *Eden Theological Seminary*

An interest in August Rauschenbusch may be motivated by the hope that perchance in the life of the father we could discover factors which would illuminate the social-gospel interests of his more famous son. The importance of Rauschenbusch in the early history of German Baptists in North America, particularly as founder and virtual head of the "German Department" of Rochester Theological Seminary for thirty-two years (1858-90),¹ should alone, it could be urged, establish his significance for the religious history of that day. However, it is the primary and less ambitious purpose of this paper to place Rauschenbusch within the framework of the German and American religious situation of the mid-19th century on the basis, largely, of twenty-two of his unpublished letters and a smaller number addressed to him, running from April 12, 1845 to September 27, 1854. These were recently discovered in the archives of the Rhenish Missionary Institute, Wuppertal-Barmen, Germany.²

We approached the study of these documents with a merely curious interest in the work of a nineteenth-century German missionary to the United States. However, it soon became apparent that we were dealing with a person who in an unusually vital and dynamic way reflected religious and cultural tensions within and between German and American movements of the day. We begin with a Rauschenbusch struggling through the phenomenal gamut of 19th century German rationalism, romanticism, orthodoxy, confessionalism, ecclesiasticism and emerging from this conflict, a radical Pietist. We continue with a Rauschenbusch projected into the maze of 19th century American Christianity bearing on it the earmarks of the Puritan heritage. We conclude with a Rauschenbusch emerging from this interpenetration of German and American traditions with a sense of freedom and emancipation which we shall refer to as his "Americanization."

We use this term, then, not so much in a technical-sociological as in the more functional sense to indicate the manner in which a unique German religious tradition was adaptable to the American religious scene. This biographical case study, with its obvious limitations, may thus suggest possibilities for more incisive investigations in the gen-

*Presidential Address, read at the session of the American Society of Church History in New York City, December 30, 1954.

eral field of German-American relations—particularly the 19th century relationship of German Pietism and American Puritanism.³

For the immediate background setting of Rauschenbusch it must suffice to note that he was the sixth in a direct line of Lutheran pastors with pietist leanings—the Lutheranism here represented being not of the narrow confessionalistic cast. As pastor of the Lutheran Church at Altena in the Prussian province of Westphalia, his father may well have belonged to the Evangelical United Church of Prussia. Nor does the family pietism fit into a negative-legalistic pattern. One is somewhat baffled with the exclamation of the father at the birth of his son, "Fear God, lead a righteous life, and become a soldier."⁴ At the age of six, his father started him with Latin, the following year with French and at eight with Greek so that he was reading Homer at fifteen. His youth was filled with affectionate, romantic love for classical antiquity.

A strong emotional strain moved his sensitive, impressionable nature—in a moment he was carried to the skies in enthusiastic committal to a burning cause, only to lapse dejectedly into deep mental and spiritual depression. His was a highly individualized, complicated personality with a hard core of basic religious drives and impulses.

His fate it was to become engaged in an agonizing struggle for faith in the midst of the most amazing interplay of socio-political, cultural, philosophical and theological cross-currents in the history of Germany—in various ways raising the issues of authority versus freedom, of form versus spirit, of the objective versus the subjective.

I. RATIONALIST PHASE

The pre-conversion struggles of Rauschenbusch—whether on political, cultural, ecclesiastical, theological or religious levels—were fought under the colors of rationalism. Always tempered by deep religious and spiritual integrity, he was not slow to welcome radical departures from traditional patterns. Again and again, in this struggle for emancipation from the welter of traditional and inherited forms, he refers to himself as a "rationalist"—sometimes, it would seem, with a note of adolescent bravado. In this spirit he defended minority groups against the massive ecclesiastical—confessional front of the German State Churches.

German Protestantism was resting on the denominational pillars of the Lutheran, the Reformed and the Evangelical United Church. This three dimensional pattern sharpened confessional distinctions and led to a narrow denominationalism against which he instinctively reacted.⁵ In seeking for a more positive unifying principle than that of a common anti-Catholic front, German Protestantism had sought to

find that principle in the sacrament of baptism whereby church membership was automatically conferred.

This disregard for the experiential significance of conversion, and the failure of a frozen orthodoxy to recognize deeper spiritual needs, led to the rise of unconventional types of piety with independent and non-ecclesiastical tendencies subject to state suppression. Similarly, foreign separatistic religious groups as Methodists and Baptists were at times violently repressed by the highly organized and authoritarian state churches. Even as a rationalistic youth, and inspired by romantic zeal for freedom from all forms of repression, Rauschenbusch was impressed by the deeper piety and other-worldliness of such non-conformists as compared with the conventional church piety of his day—to which, however, he could not commit himself.

This religious struggle moved into a decisive phase when Rauschenbusch began his theological studies at Berlin (1834). All issues were now resolved into the major conflict between the orthodox defenders of the faith and their rationalistic opponents. On the rationalist side he was impressed with Marheineke, the "romantic, speculative idealist." On the orthodox side he listed the hyperorthodox and confessionalistic Hengstenberg. And between the rationalist left and confessional right stood the pietistic Neander who rejected the narrow orthodox and confessional position of Hengstenberg. The agonizing struggle between rationalism and orthodoxy (recorded with great detail in the *Diary*) was resolved by a pietistic conversion on January 17, 1836.⁶ What was the nature and significance of this event?

II. PIETIST PHASE

Intellectually (or theologically) he had broken through to a rejection of rationalism in favor of the orthodox position, and morally he had broken through to a devastating consciousness of his lost and sinful state. However, he had not, as yet, found the emancipation which was to characterize his American period. Nor, had he even moved from the heavy negative Pietism of the 17th and 18th centuries, with its narrow moralistic stereotypes to the more tempered 19th century Pietism with its greater openmindedness toward the world and more generous acceptance of scientific learning and methods.⁷

An illuminating commentary on the legalistic spirit of the "new" Rauschenbusch is found in comments of his immediate family—particularly his father, who was appalled at his radical rejection of social and worldly contacts which he denounced as boundless "pietistic zealotism." Everything was now either black or white. The dark, black world, the great organism of sin from which he had been saved, must be rejected along with such "worldly" practices as attending the theater or visiting art galleries. In his "stormy and thunderous" in-

stallation sermon at Altena, where he succeeded his father in 1841, he flayed the members of his congregation for particular sins, demanding repentance and conversion—for which he was reprimanded by his Superintendent.⁸

However this may be, a strong, subjectivistic, experiential note characterized the pre-American Rauschenbusch. Indeed, he never outgrew the typically Pietist terminology with its repetitious and stereotyped references to *Busskampf*, bondage of Satan, "inner struggles" against temptation, the monstrous nature of sin,⁹ the need of forgiveness and conversion, the sense of "call" and of God's guiding will. Central throughout was the concept of the "kingdom" and the regenerative conversion requirement for church membership—which placed the Pietist in opposition to the state churches and to the government and provoked police interference when separatistic tendencies assumed the aspect of revolt.¹⁰

The German Pietist movement, on the whole, was preserved from abject subjectivism by an active espousal of social reform projects and by a revival of catechetical training, Bible study and the reading of books and tracts. Rauschenbusch participated in these left-wing projects and activities—assisting in the establishment of a temperance society of Altena (lamenting the fact, however, that the need of "conversion was not being adequately emphasized"), providing deaconesses to care for the poor and sick, founding kindergartens and elementary schools and young men's and young women's societies and, not least, sponsoring conventicle meetings which led to tumults verging on violence.

In the midst of these hectic developments at Altena came the sensational report that Rauschenbusch had decided to emigrate to America.¹¹ This decision had not easily ripened into a sense of call. Nothing came easy for Rauschenbusch. However, having withstood a serious illness (1844) with accompanying spiritual afflictions and inner struggles with many sleepless nights, he finally gained the assurance that the "call" was not of the "flesh" but of the Spirit. He could now freely reject all protestations and dissuasive arguments of his friends—God's will and the building of his Kingdom brooked no interference.

Of six societies referred to by Rauschenbusch as being concerned with the spiritual care of American immigrants, he applied to the so-called Langenberg Society for commissioning to the American field. The Langenberg Society, a product of Württembergian Pietism of the early 19th century, had been organized in 1837 at the suggestion of the Rhenish Foreign Mission Institute to take over its American interests. Committed to the biblicist and inter-confessional union tradition of the Evangelical United Church, its purpose was the "propa-

gation of the Christian Church among the Protestant Germans in North America."¹² The correspondence of Rauschenbusch with Langenberg indicates that even prior to his departure from Germany the issues of theological orthodoxy, Lutheran confessionalism and American denominationalism were moving toward new formulations and solutions.

The pre-conversion grapplings with rationalism had swung him toward an unmitigated orthodox position—even to the point of differing with the pietistic Neander whose mediating position on verbal inspiration for instance, he rejected with the words, "All or nothing. . . ." He radically rejected all forms of Hegelianism, the Deutero-Isaian theory, upheld the Mosaic authority of Genesis and, also against Neander, defended as unimpeachable the Christological views of the Fathers.¹³

And yet, Rauschenbusch was not orthodox in the old confessional sense. He objected, for instance, to the formal instruction of Langenberg that he

" . . . proclaim the Christian doctrine (*Lehre*) in accordance with the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as the common confessional standard of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches of Germany. . . ."

Rauschenbusch deletes the word "Unaltered," substitutes the word "truth" for "doctrine" and pointedly suggests an amendment to the effect that he would strive to lead congregations he served to join not a Lutheran or Reformed or United but a Protestant Synod in order thus to nurture the "unity in the Spirit."¹⁴

His critical attitude toward Lutheran confessionalism is revealed in his encounter on board ship with a group of eleven Bavarian theological students commissioned by Löhe of Neuendettelsau to establish a Seminary at Fort Wayne, Indiana.¹⁵ He challenged "great errors" into which these "dear people" had fallen, namely: that everyone baptized had received the Holy Spirit—Alexander VI and Robespierre included; that a person could not be twice reborn; and that wayward Christians should not be admonished to be born again. He was particularly affronted by their contention that, since of all churches the Lutheran alone possesses the full truth, any person saved in other churches actually belongs to the Lutheran Church since he is saved through truths which the Lutheran Church alone possesses. He lamented the fact that a full and free Christian witness is prevented by such bondage to dogmatic convictions and concludes his observations with the hope that the Lord would convert the Bavarians not to cry, "Church, Church!" but "Christ! Christ!"

His emancipation from narrow orthodox confessionalism and

bureaucratic ecclesiasticism led him also toward wider inter-denominational views. The specter of American "sectarianism" began to plague him as he approached his new task. He was repelled, he said, by the multitude of church divisions and denominational groups—which was not conducive to awaken joy in the heart of any friend of Christian union. Interesting, therefore, in this connection, was his rejection of Langenberg's admonition to beware of the evils of "American separatism." The term "separatist," he says, is too ambiguous, since civil powers have long been known to employ it against most honorable ("*ehrwürdigen*") men and movements. He cites, in this connection, the State persecution in 1845 of "sectarian" clergy in Switzerland accused of "Methodism."¹⁶ He would prefer, therefore, that the warning against sects be more broadly directed against "such movements which destroy and undermine sincere devotion to Christ and which disturb the living fellowship of faithful believers with their Lord."

Thus, led by the Pietist conception of the "Kingdom," Rauschenbusch was seeking a course between Continental sectarianism and intransigent state churchism. As the idea of "unity of the Spirit" and the assertion of equal and free rights, as descriptive of the Kingdom, were projected into denominational relations, the walls of separation, he hoped, would be destroyed. Had this not been evidenced in Germany by the rise of numerous interdenominational societies—including that of Langenberg!

III. PIETIST-PURITAN PHASE

This, then, was the Rauschenbusch who arrived in New York in September, 1846. How would the American situation, with its unaccustomed freedoms and its multifarious religious forms, affect the further development of the Rauschenbusch personality?

Mid-19th century America was still fermenting under the influences of a Puritanism which, under the impact of New England conditions, had undergone a type of Americanization. The rethinking of inherited concepts had led to a modification of traditional theological emphases, ecclesiastical forms and evangelistic methods—involving at times an obvious departure from the classical Reformation tradition. When revivalism subordinated the emphasis on objective doctrinal standards to individualistic conversion experience, and when narrow corporate church concepts came under the influence of broader Kingdom ideals, the self-understanding of the established churches was challenged. And, if on the one hand, American Protestantism was divided by a wide proliferation of denominations, sects, separatists and nonconformists as well as by competing philosophies and theologies, it was also characterized by a free unitive movement manifest in various types of interdenominational cooperation.

How did the German immigrant become adjusted or Americanized to this "wild" religious situation? In the first place there was no assimilation of the respective traditions comparable to the amalgamation of Old and New England cultures into a common Anglo-American religious front. Instead of being assimilated into the prevailing American mores, German groups, because of temperamental, sociological and language factors, needed, first of all, to become physically and sociologically adjusted to the new environment in which they sought to perpetuate their traditions. Depending on social conditions and personality factors, German attitudes toward Puritan ideals varied greatly. In widespread areas a violent emotional opposition developed against so-called Puritan "legalisms" in the field of Sabbath observance, temperance agitation, amusements, etc. With deeper historical and theological discernment men like Philip Schaff raised incisive questions concerning the spiritual defalcations of Puritanism and its betrayal of the Reformation tradition. Questions like these point to the involved *Problematik* of German-American relations in the 19th century within the framework of which the adjustment of Rauschenbusch to the American situation took place. How would he adjust himself to the prevailing religious and socio-historical patterns—the revival-evangelistic pattern, the denominational pattern, the societal, theological and educational patterns of the day?

The sheer physical immensity of the New World had the effect of strengthening his sense of mission, enlarging his sphere of activities and deepening his concept of the Kingdom—all within the sway of German Pietism and American Puritanism. This process was marked by continuing tensions, hard struggles and encounters which led to a series of emancipating experiences which no Old World situation could have induced.

The first of these break-through experiences was in the field of American denominationalism where his first difficulty was with the Methodists. His initial encounter with the Methodists in New York had awakened misgivings, if not resentment—for how could they have asked him to join their denomination when they did not even know whether he was converted? He was not impressed, he says, but he would not make up his mind too hastily. Had he not come to America as a "Messenger of Peace" to build the Kingdom? "God has given me," he testified, "a free evangelical spirit to seek and find his children under all sorts of denominational names and forms." He proposed to preserve this spirit and to do his part ". . . to reduce the walls of division between the various denominations that they may finally break down."¹⁷

As he moved westward from New York to Chicago to St Louis,

and finally to Mt. Sterling, Missouri, he became further involved in the spreading denominational web—which caused fierce struggles of soul and conscience. After five months he reports from Mt. Sterling concerning the brochure he had written on America, which was printed in Germany under the title *Die Nacht des Westens*, in which he denounced the Methodists as insincere—everywhere intent on converting to their Church but not to the Kingdom.¹⁸

However, a year later, after another struggle with his soul and conscience, he records another “conversion”—this time from “the bitter spirit of narrow partisanship.” He contritely confesses that instead of having been a *Friedensbote* he had stirred the fires of party strife. Under the remonstrance of Wm. Nast, editor of the *Christliche Apologete*, he had publicly and humbly retracted his anti-Methodist statements in an article in which he likewise retracted his utterances against the Old Lutherans.¹⁹ He had penitently written to Walther and concludes with the sentiment that, “If we shall in heaven love each other as children of one God, why should we not be doing that even now?”²⁰ Here, then, was a breakthrough of the Pietist Kingdom idea on the American denominational front.

The Methodist encounter, on the one hand, had the effect of loosening his relations with the German Society, which reprimanded him for his softening and vacillating attitude—which strengthened his conviction that the Old World could not understand the New. It also had the effect of committing him to high espousal of the Kingdom idea among American denominations. This led to close collaboration with the American Tract and the American Home Missionary Societies. Interdenominational in their inception and reflecting the zeal of a Presbyterian and Congregational hardcore constituency, these societies were projecting the Puritan spirit into the frontier West.

Rauschenbusch's connection with the American Home Missionary Society, the great sponsoring agency for evangelistic work among the Germans in the West, revolved largely around the regenerate membership requirement. The Society had begun to look with suspicion on the lax procedures prevailing in German churches where baptism or confirmation were the sole requirement for membership. The arrival of freethinking “Forty-Eighters” precipitated a crisis; for the Society now indicated unmistakably that it preferred to assist churches which officially renounced the “loose mode” of admitting by confirmation all who had reached the age of fourteen or who could recite the catechism and were not openly immoral. In dealing with this German problem the Society sought the advice of Rauschenbusch and found in him an ardent supporter of its rigorous “Puritan” policy—ready to report on conditions prevailing in the German churches in the West. Indeed,

Rauschenbusch helped formulate the German policy of the Society in this manner, namely, that "evidence of a new heart and of having been born again by the Spirit of God" was a necessary condition for receiving aid.²¹

More significant for Rauschenbusch's integration into American religious life was his official connection with the American Tract Society. This involved such a radical departure from the traditional German missionary pattern that, in informing Langenberg of his intention, he found it difficult if not impossible to "rethink" himself into the old German situation. Indeed, he fears that Langenberg would not understand nor correctly interpret the interdenominational character of the Tract Society which "As no other Society succeeds in unifying all the denominations to its support."²²

He threw himself into his new work with such zest and devotion that he soon became the key man in the relations of the Society to the German and a trusted consultant in matters of policy. All of the existent tracts were given a thorough revision and new ones were added—written in his own clear German. He organized the German colportage system, maintained contacts with representatives over a territory extending from Missouri through New England into Canada, holding conferences, preaching, distributing tracts, spending long periods with immigrants on Staten Island. More and more he was impressed by the unselfish liberality and magnanimity of American Christians which made possible the wide distribution of Christian literature to German immigrants "from cellars and attics of large cities to the log cabins in the West."²³ In these activities he was being prepared for the greatest crisis of his life—his Baptist conversion.

IV. BAPTIST PHASE

The letter in which he informs Langenberg of his decision to join the Baptists is a remarkable document. Before stating the reasons for this action he proposes to disarm any preconceived criticism by explaining what did *not* determine him to take this step. He did *not* hope thereby to profit in any material way. He was *not* led either by hate of or by love for any particular persons; indeed he loves many Christians of other denominations more than he does Baptists. *Nor* was it necessary to take this step in order to be in fellowship with living Christians; for he has found them among Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists. *Nor* did he hope to find among the Baptists a better church order; for even the Presbyterians had a better system than his own Lutheran Church. *Nor* had he succumbed to the immediate influence of Baptist environment; for he always had had less relations with Baptists than with members of other denominations. *Nor* did he seek by this step to find peace with God; for by the grace of

God he has already found that. On the other hand, his action was simply prompted, as he said, by "... the understanding that I have not yet been baptized and by the desire, since the Lord by his grace has granted me faith, also to accept the order which he himself propounded in the words, 'Whosoever believes and is baptized will be saved'..."²⁴

Here, then, is the acceptance of a new position within the framework of German Pietism and Lutheranism—not without an impetus derived from American religious influences. Theologically, Rauschenbusch retained the Reformation emphasis on "justification by faith" and quotes Luther's conception of baptism as a burial with Christ, which, he says, calls for immersion as the logical method and the original form. If, as he claimed, he had held these views in Germany their implications had come to new expression in the uninhibitive American environment. Here, in the maelstrom of many denominations, he could compare the "churches which practice child-baptism with those who did not"—which sharpened the contrast between churches of grace and faith, and those of ceremonies and magical formality.

A further unique characteristic of his conversion to the Baptists, not conceivable in Germany, was his continuing appreciation for the truth held by other denominations. He did not become a "sectarian" but continued in cordial relations with other denominations. That baptist views were held by Baptists was relatively incidental. In this sense he was converted not to the Baptist denomination but to a deeper comprehension of the Kingdom. Consequently he still considers all those who love the Lord Jesus as his brothers and discovers no wall of separation between him and those who hold different views. Although he could no longer accept the Augsburg Confession as a normative standard, he would not sever connections with those who did. He hopes that cordial and cooperative relations may be continued with Langenberg as before—according to the Spirit of Him who prayed to his Father "that they may all be done." In the spirit of the interdenominational brotherhood, which he found in the cooperation of American denominations of differing views, he proposed to negotiate a plan of cooperation between Langenberg and the American Home Missionary Society and proposed a formal agreement toward that end.

Such interdenominationalism was foreign to the German mind and he takes pains to explain how it manifested itself on the American scene. He refers to Reformed pastors in New York who permitted him, the Baptist, to preach in their churches—with the approval of his Baptist brethren. Similarly a Baptist preacher had approved his preaching in an Evangelical United Church and many of the Evangelicals in turn attended his service in the Baptist Church

—at which service a Presbyterian minister prayed for the spread of the Gospel in general and for the Baptist Church in particular. All this, he emphasizes, could well happen in America but not in a Germany filled with intolerance toward “sectarian Baptists and Methodists.”

Devotion to the truth as he saw it, however, compelled him to sever official connections with his own Lutheran Church. He desired no unity attained at the cost of truth. Therefore, “Unity through truth—that is my motto; for it can only be through the rejection of what we recognize as human defections from God’s order that the original purity and beauty of that order will be established. More through example than by words—more through mildness than by sharp argument will the Lord be able to bring about a unity in his Church.”²⁵

With this statement of ecumenical devotion this chapter in the life of August Rauschenbusch may be concluded. Many questions remain unanswered. Which of the Baptist groups today may best lay claim to the Rauschenbusch tradition? How much of the Rauschenbusch spirit is reflected in the life and work of Walter Rauschenbusch which, from the perspective of the father, may be traced with added insight and understanding? However this may be, the life of August Rauschenbusch suggests the need for further and more incisive studies of issues involved in the “Americanization” of immigrant religious groups in their response to the challenge of American Protestantism in the 19th century.

1. *These Glorious Years, The Centenary History of German Baptists of North America, 1843-1943* (Cleveland, n. d.); A. J. Ramaker, *The German Baptists in North America* (Cleveland, 1924); *Das Theologische Seminar der Deutschen Baptisten, Rochester, N. Y., 1852-1927* (1927). With the shift of German population to the West, with the dropping of the word “German” and the removal from Rochester in 1949, the German Seminary (“Department”) continued as the North American Baptist Seminary at Sioux Falls, South Dakota, under the auspices of the North American Baptist General Conference.
2. Basic sources in addition to this correspondence (referred to as *L. Cor.*) include: Walter Rauschenbusch, *Leben und Wirken von August Rauschenbusch* (Cleveland, 1901), largely biographical and completed by his son with copious extracts from his *Diary*. D. R. Sharpe, in his *Walter Rauschenbusch* (New York, 1942), p. viii, refers to a “huge stack of material—letters, sermons, lectures, diaries . . .” but I have not been able to ascertain the existence of any “Rauschenbuschiana” containing re-

plies to above letters or to locate the whereabouts of sources quoted in the *Leben*. Cf. general bibliographical references in Ramaker, *Op. cit.*

3. Similar studies may be suggested in the “Americanization” of contemporary German pioneers as Philip Schaff (Reformed, Swiss born, 1819-1893); Wm. Nast (Methodist, 1807-1899); Joseph Rieger (Evangelical United, 1811-1869); Ezra Keller (Lutheran, 1812-1848); J. Oertel (Episcopalian, 1823-1909). Others could be mentioned.
4. *Leben*, p. 6 f.
5. His religious tutor at Elberfeld was the Lutheran Pastor K. A. Döring (1783-1844) of the United Church. He also relates that while at Elberfeld he attended services in the “Unter Barmen” Church (Gemarker) where the Reformed spirit prevailed—approximating the Union point of view. *Leben*, 20 p. 146.
6. The vacillating nature of the Berlin struggle in its varied aspects is graphically recorded in the *Diary* beginning with entries on January 1 of the preceding year, which are recorded in *Leben*, pp. 68-80. The highly tense and emotional experience was followed by

- physical exhaustion and a nervous breakdown.
7. The new Pietism did not seriously inveigh against cards, theatre, dancing, smiling, jesting, smoking, pleasantries, laughing, even taking walks. Note classical remark of A. Menken (1768-1831) about enjoying nature with a cigar in the mouth.
 8. *Leben*, p. 82 ff.; p. 106 f.
 9. At the birth of his first son (1857) Rauschenbusch addressed a letter to his friend Joseph Rieger with the comment, "If you would show me a kindness, then pray . . . that God might bless my son, who has inherited from me nothing but sin, death and damnation, and permit him to inherit life and salvation in Christ so that he may not become a firebrand of hell (*Hoellenbrand*), toward which he already has all tendencies, thanks to his parents . . ." Mt. Sterling, Mo., May 6, 1857.
 10. Where Pietism, favored by a benevolent State, was permitted freely to assert its independent and at times almost separatistic characteristics, as in Württemberg, a tremendous spiritual vitality developed.
 11. At this point the *Leben* loses its autobiographical character as his son takes over the narrative, lamenting the fact that not much is known of the period between his resignation from the Altena church on May 13, 1845 and his sailing on July 5, 1846. Some of the gaps are filled by the Langenberg correspondence, which describes not only the continuing tensions and struggles but also the gradual emergence of certain new insights and convictions which came to highest fruition in his American labors.
 12. See my *The German Church on the American Frontier* (St. Louis, 1939), p. 7 ff.
 13. *Leben*, p. 77 ff.
 14. *L. Cor.*, Elberfeld, May 29, 1846.
 15. *L. Cor.*, Farewell letter from Bremen, July 5, 1846 and first letter from New York, Sept. 7, 1846. Löhe's early emissaries had joined the Ohio and Michigan Synods but united in 1845 to establish the more rigidly confessionalistic, anti-unionistic theological seminary at Ft. Wayne, Ind. which opened in the following year with 16 students, mostly from Neuendettelsau, Bavaria. When Löhe's emissaries joined Missouri Synod the Seminary was taken over.
 16. The revival in Vaud, Switzerland, originating with English Methodists, had led to the rise of conventicles which were suppressed by the government. Following the revolution of 1845, 150 "separatists" and "sectarian" clergy, accused of "Methodism," were dismissed—leading to the founding of "The Free Church of Vaud" in 1847. *L. Cor.* New York, Sept. 7, 1846.
 17. *L. Cor.*, Gravois, Mo., Oct. 22, 1846.
 18. *Ibid.*, Mt. Sterling, Mo., March 31, 1847.
 19. *Christliche Apogete*, Cincinnati, March 3, 1848. Note further feudings on this subject between W. Nast, C. F. Walther, F. Wyneken, P. Schaff, W. Schmidt referred to in Schneider, *Op. cit.*, p. 379.
 20. *L. Cor.* New York, Mar. 22, 1848.
 21. *A.H.M.S. Correspondence*, J. Young, Quincy, Ill., July 28, 1853. See Schneider *Op. cit.*, p. 153, p. 238 ff.
 22. *L. Cor.*, Mt. Sterling, Mo., Aug. 6, 1847.
 23. *L. Cor.*, Mt. Sterling, Mo., April 8, 1850; *Leben*, p. 130 ff.
 24. *Ibid.* Note also lengthy exposition of his theological views on the subject.
 25. *L. Cor.*, New York, Aug. 13, 1850. The last letter addressed to Langenberg from America marks the beginning of a period of forty-nine years of active service in the German Baptist Church. The documentation for this period must be found in other sources, (particularly the German Baptist publication, *Der Sendbote*), which require further scrutiny with respect to developments along lines indicated above.

THE *VITA APOSTOLICA*: DIVERSITY OR DISSENT*

ERNEST W. McDONNELL, *Rutgers University*

The concept *vita apostolica*¹ embraced three basic principles: imitation of the primitive church, poor, simple, and penitential, with interests and activities restricted to the spiritual domain; a passionate love for souls at home and far afield; and evangelical poverty in common, either predicated on mendicancy or mitigated by the work of one's own hands.² It became, during the age of Gregorian reform and after, a compelling program instinct with the fervor, spontaneity, and humanity of the first community at Jerusalem (Acts, iv, 32; cf. Luke, x, 1-12). It postulated reform and criticism in a restless age of expanding economic and geographical horizons, a more rational political system, an increasingly complex social organization, a multiplicity of divergent intellectual currents, and corresponding new spiritual needs. Such a momentous evolution of society, challenging the *status quo* in all its parts, demanded a reappraisal of the resources and ends of the church, the most powerful and tenacious defender of tradition.

The first principle suggested above demanded imitation of the Apostles and Christ, now couched less in hieratic form than as suffering mankind. It offered examples for direct experience, the turning within oneself in search of God together with outward signs of repentance. The second principle put a premium on itinerant preaching and this, both in contrast to monastic stability and as a supplement to the episcopal pulpit, became a primary implement of reform from the first third of the twelfth century. While the conservative Rupert of Deutz construed the realities of the primitive church around the "common life," other evangelicals, expressing wider aspirations, stretched it to proselytism rather than subjective experience. The apostolate makes the apostle. The cure of souls required in rising urban centers afforded a fresh context for the apostolic life in the generation of St. Norbet of Xanten.³ As apostolic preachers on foot, Robert d'Arbrisselles, Bernard de Tiron, Vital de Savigny, Lambert le Bègue, Peter Waldo, St. Francis of Assisi, and John Huss, all wished in one way or another to judge daily life by the criterion of scripture. It sharpened the social conscience of the Friars Minor. Again, who better than Jacques de Vitry illustrates how fervent crusade sermon against heretic and infidel, and zealous pastoral care are the two sides of the same coin?

The principle, "common life" by dispossession of private goods

*Read, in substance, at a session of the American Historical Association in New York City, December 28, 1954.

or absolute detachment from externals, furnished both the economic and spiritual basis of the ideal. "Those alone are apt for the *officium praedicationis*," argued Peter Damian, "who have the benefit of no terrestrial wealth and who, because they have nothing for themselves, possess everything in common."⁴ For some a delinquent clergy was the target; for others society no less could be rejuvenated by the communism of the primitive church. Poverty, whether voluntary or an idealization of harsh fact, posed the thorniest problems for church and state. On the one hand it challenged traditional prerogatives and pretensions which resembled a mantle for vested interests; on the other hand its solutions were basically romantic. In a conciliatory mood Innocent III sought to adapt these generous feelings to the church. John XXII's strictures on the Spiritual Franciscans a century later are well-known: "Great is poverty, but greater is blamelessness, and perfect obedience is the greatest good."⁵ Again St. Paul's recommendation of manual labor as an expression of penitential intent provided a moral sanction for the fruits of the artisan's work.

While the history of the *ecclesia Romana*, and specifically monasticism⁶ and canons regular⁷ as the chief safeguard of "apostolic perfection," reveals an inexhaustible, ever creating vitality by periodically recovering evangelical discipline, the plethora of protest and reform from Hildebrand to the Brethren of the Common Life and John Huss, ordinarily found its inspiration and guidance in the demands of the *vita apostolica*. This is in the main the common denominator of most of those multifarious movements and conflicting personalities of what may be conveniently called the Medieval Reformation. Urban II's bull, addressed to the Church of Raitenbuch in Bavaria (1092), became a charter of two orthodox forms of the apostolic life: *vita monastica* and *vita canonica*.⁸ An introduction through Niketas, heretical "bishop" of Constantinople, of Bogomile dogma of rigorous dualism and ecclesiasticism into Western Cathari circles accounted for a shift from apostolic poverty to an unchristian position.⁹ Before the close of the century the apostolic ideal was guiding the protestantism of the Waldensian against Catholic and Cathari alike. It channelled the militant aims of the Order of Preachers. Its logic divided the Franciscans into hostile camps. If the *Eternal Gospel* of Joachim of Flora was as revolutionary as the Poor Men of Lyons,¹⁰ John Peter Olivi's principal crime was strict observance of the Rule.¹¹ The mendicant orders invaded the time-honored preserves which the triple function of parochial authority promised. Arnold of Brescia preached against clerical delinquency and worldly considerations with an energy and success which at one time threatened revolution in great cities.¹²

The reform was originally religious and theological in nature,

but its historical significance was due less to religious doctrine than to the social forces which translated it into fact.¹³ Socially, intense devotion to the apostolic life coincided with the communes and the louder articulation of townsmen on matters of faith and politics. Urban centers, and more especially the cloth industry, were in ferment. As an asceticism for urban society, the *vita apostolica* befitted a climate in which the silence and prayer envisaged by St. Jerome¹⁴ for monastic precincts was no longer at home. The ideal could fuse with local social and economic grievance and political disaffection, either expressing itself in opposition to local ecclesiastical and temporal lords or resistance to external interference by towns ready to brave excommunication and interdict in defense of their liberties.¹⁵ The Pataria, for instance, assumed a dual role; to break the lordship of feudal bishops over Milan and emancipate the church for evangelical ends. Similarly, in Orvieto and Viterbo political opposition to papal power found in heresy (Cathari or Patarini) a lever which it did not hesitate to use.¹⁶ Under Wyclif and Huss the *vita apostolica* could coalesce with the broader currents of early nationalism. Wyclif, in particular, combined the "apostolic church" and independence of secular authority in a theory of divine law.

The ideal *vita apostolica* may have been vague in legislation, but it assumed concreteness as a way of life. It was not a function; it was not an *officium* of preaching or of administering sacraments. Advocates exacted right social conduct, predicated on interior well-being.¹⁷ As a program, however, the ideal carried within itself the germs of conflict between authority and criticism. Although St. Norbert realized that fidelity to apostolic principles did not exclude the choice of a more definite rule of religious life,¹⁸ yet such reforming impulses have a fatal tendency to crystallize. Ranks close at the expense of enthusiasm. Since the evangelical reawakening was not by institutional revision of existing forms, but by return to the gospel beyond these forms, the principle of its efflorescence—the bond of fraternal love and poverty—were all the more appealing to laymen or extraregulars than to clerics caught in organized authority and wielding the sanctions of worldly punishment. Layfolk wanted not less religion, but more of the right kind. By choosing vernacular sermon and scripture as their weapons and creating Bible-reading communities they assured vitality to reform. They were to tap the possibilities of the ideal more fully than canonical reform did.¹⁹ The response could be orthodox, exacting submission to the hierarchy and the sacraments of the church, or heterodox, premised on the conviction that even if that hierarchy were able to cleanse itself and assume effective leadership its prerogatives and functions could still be challenged. Popular heresy, touched by Gregorian reform, was practical, ethical, without extensive theology. Intellectually, the evangelical movement was the counterpart of scholastic-

ism. The *vita apostolica* was not only enlivened by the examples of individual reformers and by the foundation of religious orders, but also by the establishment of sects which were forced by conviction or by circumstances to separate themselves from the church.

What has just been said should not be considered a brief for socio-economic causation exclusively. Motives are at best obscure and elusive. An uncritical examination of hagiographer and moralist leads to the conclusion that spiritual forces were of paramount importance whereas socio-economic factors can be discerned in these sources only by reading between the lines, if at all. Statutes and cartularies reveal more faithfully the complexity of the problem. The Ghent memorial of 1328, drawn up at the instance of the bishop of Tournai to rehabilitate the local beguines, demonstrates that contemporaries were fully cognizant of impersonal forces.²⁰ On the other hand, Herbert Grundmann²¹ marshalled a persuasive array of evidence from the early history of the Humiliati, Waldensians, and Franciscans to refute the easily generalized sociological views widely prevalent after 1880, especially in certain German circles, that the religious cult of poverty, with its frequent anticlerical strain, was born in the lowest social strata,—among impoverished workers or the urban “proletariat.”²² That the *Frauenfrage*, for example, was essentially socio-economic cannot be contested. But it also involved a religious question, for spiritual yearnings conditioned choice of vocation. This was reflected in the extraordinary influx to nunneries, the appeal of semi-religious solutions, and the lively controversy within new and old monachism over the *cura mulierum*. How complex motives are is well illustrated by the Belgian beguines.²³

Under the leaven of the *vita apostolica* the high Middle Ages witnessed an extraordinarily rich variety of religious experience and proliferation of orders and sects. Fundamental social change rather than particularism now governed diversity. How deeply the *ordo monastica* would be shaken by the evangelical call is reflected in the voluminous literature of the twelfth century. Rupert of Deutz experienced both enthusiasm and embarrassment. Lay brethren—*conversi*—represented an early attempt to bridge laity and regular; their appearance is explained by a trend to conversion which induced individuals and whole families to submit to the school of an itinerant preacher. Recluses of the medieval kind²⁴ as well as hermits were consulted by “apostolic men.” Many a monastery and even parents of orders grew from such intimacy. Double convents were a tentative response to the feminine religious movement. But with convents practicing exclusion as feudal appanages, that movement had to seek an outlet in extraregular forms. Military and crusading orders fused monastic asceticism with the active life of the fighting man.²⁵ Hospitals and hospital orders, sponsored under

church, private, or municipal auspices, attested to the maturing of a social conscience. Canonical congregations jostled monks and priests alike, with the friars under papal blessing dominating the scene. Alongside clerics who abandoned prebends to espouse poverty were laymen of every status. As early as 1091 Urban II had approved communities of laymen living in common. They are "all the more worthy to be perpetuated since the image of the primitive church is imprinted on them."²⁶ The scope of this early popular religious tide can best be appreciated in the context in which Bernold of Constance put this bull.²⁷ Of peculiar interest are the numerous quasi-religious or extraregular associations of the devout, whether autonomous brotherhoods and sisterhoods absorbed into the ecclesiastical fabric as tertiaries or rejected as sectarians. This "middle way" appealed above all to family people. The Humiliati anticipated such tripartite orders.

Within the fold, fragmentation of the Benedictine monolith was called diversity: outside the pale it was heresy. Although the *mulieres sanctae* and *mulieres religiosas* were a source of embarrassment to Premonstratensian, Cistercian, and Dominican and their cure was assumed with reluctance, theirs nevertheless was a substantial contribution to medieval spirituality, whether it was the prophecy of Hildegarde of Bingen or the beguine Hadewijch, the efflorescence of Cistercian nunneries, the penitential order of Mary Magdalene, or the beguinal way of life. Preparation for Meister Eckhart was long, with the mysticism he represents indebted to a vigorous interplay of spiritual forces in the Rhineland and the diocese of Liège and duchy of Brabant from Hildegarde and Elizabeth of Schönau through Hadewijch, Beatrice of Nazareth, to Christine of Stommeln. Without pressing for direct lines of succession, Lambert le Bègue, patron of the beguine prototype and "a fervent preacher of the new religion which filled Liège and the neighboring regions"²⁸ may be mentioned with Gerard Groote, "the source and origin of the New Devotion."²⁹ Not only did Belgium experience through its extraregulars the same exaltation that is associated with St. Francis in Umbria, but devotion to the eucharist which fired his imagination was a peculiar asset of Belgian piety. It was no accident that the Feast of Corpus Christi had its origins in Liège. Moreover it is possibly not so much a question of parallel development between the Franciscans in the south and the extraregulars of Belgium, as of actual interpenetration of ideas with Jacques de Vitry acting as the intermediary.³⁰

After considering various kinds of religious life advised by bishops and abbots, St. Norbert chose the Augustinian rule because, his biographer explains,³¹ he did not wish to abandon either the canonical profession to which he and most of his followers belonged from childhood,

or the apostolic life adopted during preaching forays. He had heard that after the Apostles Augustine was the principal promoter of the ideal, even though not a founder of orders.³²

Currency of the Rule of St. Augustine for orders, congregations, and hospitals³³ was an important symptom of the fracturing of Benedictine unity. Not only was canonical reform under Augustinian prescriptions a primary source of diversity,³⁴ but diversity of customs confirmed the ambiguity of the formula *secundum regulam S. Augustini*. Twelfth century conciliar legislation put the two western rules on equal footing.³⁵ Sponsors of canonical reform in the Gregorian period cast doubts on the legitimacy of the adaptations introduced into the monastic world since Benedict of Aniane and the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle (816). It began as a renewal of eremitical life in monasticism as the basis of a struggle against lay encroachment. By the middle of the eleventh century reformers were seeking to capture the *vita apostolica* for the entire clergy through renunciation of private property and by equating "common life" with "canonical life."³⁶

Two currents may be discerned in the evolution of canonical principles. The first in point of time, the *ordo antiquus*, moderate, and based on the *regula tertia*, prescribed common life but retained ancient customs with respect to liturgy, fasting, and clothing. It struck its roots in St. Rufus in Provence and St. Quentin at Beauvais.³⁷ In communities of canons regular of diverse origins which adopted this ideal, traditional practices of fasts, abstinence, and office remained in force until, in eremitical foundations, the need to apply literally a rule attributed to St. Augustine gave birth to more austere customs. Subject to fluctuations at first, this new orientation (*ordo novus*) became more consistent when the partisans justified their customs by invoking the patronage of the bishop of Hippo whose authentic rule they thought they had discovered in the *Ordo monasterii (regula secunda)*. Applied literally at Springiersbach shortly after 1100 and by St. Norbert at Prémontré about 1120, this text constituted the basis of a new *ordo* implying austerity cherished by hermits and a stricter type of poverty. Manual work was considered an essential element of the *vita apostolica*. The *ordo novus*, under Premonstratensian auspices, caused among canons regular a crisis analogous to that which Cistercian customs had introduced into monachism. However, the sponsors of this new canonical formula could not long maintain the primitive simplicity. With papal permission they abandoned before 1130 the extraordinary liturgy of the *Ordo monasterii* and softened other practices. Under this mitigated form the *ordo novus* exercised a considerable influence not only on small communities like Saint-Pierremont in Lorraine and Oigny in Burgundy, but also on significant centers like Saint-Vic-

tor at Paris and Arrouaise in the diocese of Arras.³⁸ Jacques de Vitry, himself a canon at Oignies in Brabant, could wax eloquent over the "royal middle path" provided by the Rule of St. Augustine. Seven streams, he pointed out, flowed from this source.³⁹

Coexistence of these two profoundly different interpretations of the Rule of St. Augustine provoked in canonical centers after 1120 anxiety, hesitation, and crises which more than once threatened the stability of the communities.⁴⁰ It was at the root of impassioned polemics between Cluny, the principal representative of tradition, and the youthful Cîteaux, with Peter the Venerable and St. Bernard of Clairvaux as contestants, on the relative merits of *vita arctior* and *vita laxior*.⁴¹ Canons regular, too, were confronted with monks of Cluniac type (which included all monks who had remained faithful to the discipline fixed by Benedict of Aniane, in contrast to the new orders, Vallombrosa, Chartreuse, and Cîteaux, whose attitude to the canons regular was more favorable).⁴² On both sides they claimed to unite dignity of priesthood with the practice of evangelical counsel. Defenders of the various orders elaborated the history and established the antiquity of their respective foundations even by manufacturing documents. The struggle over values, growth, popularity, and *Lebensraum* led to vital claims of primacy and priority; while one wing might be expelled for heterodoxy, room was found for the majority in the ecclesiastical organism. But on the local plane one encounters the scepticism and jealousy of "molesti caluminatores," or as Jacques de Vitry called them, "viri maliciosi." On a broader plane the scope of ensuing bitterness can best be gauged by the caustic attacks Matthew Paris and Guillaume de Saint-Amour hurled at the mendicant orders on behalf of older monachism and an undiminished hierarchy respectively. Subsidiary consequences of the approved plurality of orders were a multitude of disputes over order-migration or order-jumping and acts of piracy which were brought before Roman legates and led to decisions in papal bulls and conciliar legislation.⁴³

While Rupert of Deutz deplored growth of diversity, Anselm of Havelberg⁴⁴ drafted, at the behest of the papal curia, an answer to those shocked that in the church which was one, holding a single faith, so many novelties of such different *religion* appear everywhere in a multitude of forms. The scope of conscience was defined by the condition of "una forma credendi et multiformitate vivendi"—one belief but many ways of living.⁴⁵ On his mission in Constantinople (1135-36) Anselm had done "what apostolic authority commanded, for it must always be obeyed not only in devout humility but also out of need of eternal salvation."⁴⁶ Convinced that multiplicity of orders was a sign of a healthy, historical organism, the Premonstratensian set out to harmonize growth and diversity with the underlying principle of unity.⁴⁷

Just as Jacques de Vitry's *Historia Orientalis et Occidentalis* must be supplemented by the case study of canonical fervor and Cistercian austerity contained in the *Life* of Mary of Oignies, so the *History* in conjunction with the *Sermones Vulgares* adds approbation of diversity and multiplicity of lay and religious society. One of his many talents was the ability to cast an indulgent eye on so many manifestations of popular religion and by comparative study to discern beneath superficial differences a single purpose. His moral indignation was assuaged by ubiquitous hopeful signs of social rejuvenation. For him monasticism was no longer "the city of God to which one brings the world." His was an active life, stirring the populace by his *exempla*-studded sermons or marching with crusade armies. How far the idea of vocation had been extended, beyond Honorius of Autun,⁴⁸ to the estates of profane life without exception may be seen in the sermons of both Jacques and Humbert de Romans. But the bishop of Acre had more of a historical approach than the Dominican general. Moreover his European-wide perspective and his sympathy for every expression of popular piety that could be fitted into the ecclesiastical fabric grew out of extensive travel and observation as well as personal solicitude at the Roman curia and active support in creating new houses. His justification of different habit and change of statute as well as new foundations was that of a moralist. Corruption calls forth life. He saw on all sides forces at work combating evil: Franciscans, beguines. Humiliati, canons regular, and such *virī apostolici* as John of Nivelles, Foulques de Neuilly, and Robert de Courçon. Against the heretic, however, Jacques remained adamant.⁴⁹

Diversity of religious life might accordingly be embraced in a profounder unity. But confronted with widespread disaffection in southern Europe, the papacy took steps to curb the proliferation of orders. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215)⁵⁰ prescribed new congregations only within recognized rules and with papal approbation. How ineffectual this pronouncement was may be concluded from the Second Council of Lyons (1274) which curtailed above all the multiplication of mendicant orders.⁵¹ Yet half a century later Clementine and Johanneine legislation pertaining to beguines and beghards at once admitted the difficulty of controlling the mushrooming of extraregular associations and reflected a desire through "saving clauses" to allow the orthodox to survive.

Granted the premise of a society founded on community of faith as the church is a community of saints, heretics and pagans alike become foreigners to the established polity. The church militant wages an incessant conflict both for preservation of the purity of its doctrine and for its liberty in proclaiming it. Heresy was construed as a deliber-

ate denial of some article of doctrine and a public and obstinate persistence in the error. Guilt was incurred by the person who knew the doctrine of the church and yet denied it or believed contrary to it, while a person would not be guilty of heresy who was ignorant of the true doctrine. Although pagans and Jews ought not to be coerced to the faith, for belief depends on will, nevertheless action against them was justified because of their blasphemy, subtle persuasion, and open persecution which obstructed the faith.⁵² We have seen that Anselm of Havelberg's formula underlying his approbation of diversity denied toleration, or better still, coexistence to the sectarian. By force, St. Augustine had insisted, men may be brought to see the true faith. This he reinforced by theological arguments based upon an alleged interpretation of Christ's parable of the Lord and His supper; "Compel them to come in" (Luke, xiv, 23).

The only ground for toleration is expediency, but the scope of that expediency, ecclesiastical, political, and religious,⁵³ depends on the position of the church in society. For a belief in the efficacy of coercion the church had no occasion to formulate a theory in a period when it was itself a persecuted body. Tertullian's generous attitude that "it is not the nature of religion to coerce religion, which must be adopted freely and not by force"⁵⁴ was lost with the end of minority status. Strong and confident as an all-embracing, self-contained body, with the acquiescence of the state, the church need brook no dissent. It held toleration of others to be the persecution of itself.

Caesarius of Heisterbach⁵⁵ agreed that Saracens and Jews possessed many virtues which honest Christians could not help recognizing: prejudice disappeared in the wake of an understanding of different religions. The Three Rings demonstrated that so long as any dispute remained among the rivals, how could anyone be genuine? Conversion rather than extermination of infidels recommended the study of oriental languages by pope, friar, and layman down to the Council of Vienne (1311). Blind suppression of Aristotle's metaphysics and ethics was superseded by the enlightened approach of Thomas Aquinas. Sects, competing with the church for influence over the people, would have been compelled to purge gradually their own errors. They in turn would have forced upon the church the purgation demanded in polemic and satire. Despite such evidence of broader understanding, the path to salvation continued just as straight and narrow. Toleration, after all, is compounded of expediency and secularism. Against extreme penalty Peter Cantor protested: "How does the church presume to examine by (this) foreign judgment the hearts of men? Or how is it that the Cathari are given no legitimate respite for deliberation, but are burned forthright?"⁵⁶ When there is no danger of uprooting the wheat and no

threat of schism, violent measures may be used. In making such a recommendation Thomas Aquinas distorted Augustine's interpretation of the death penalty in an effort to defend the current criminal code.⁵⁷

The Fourth Lateran Council was the fulfillment of the *Dictatus Papae* and Gregorian Reform. Here the lines were sharply drawn between faithful and heretic; but definition of doctrine merely makes the division between saint and dissenter arbitrary. Yet Dante recognized the limits of protest. He cut short his castigation of Pope Nicholas III: "And were it not that reverence for the Great Keys thou heldest in the glad life yet hinders me, I should use still heavier words."⁵⁸ Enhancement of papal prestige and power together with growth of canon law was accompanied by an enlargement of the scope of obedience. The limits of toleration were contracted. Similarly, the crusade as a source of European unity against external foes became an instrument of papal centralization; as such, it inflamed passions on both sides.⁵⁹ Internal enemies included not only those against the faith, but also opponents of papal authority; whoever denied the sovereignty of Rome, said Gregory VII, is a heretic.⁶⁰ Whoever remained excommunicated for a year, the Fourth Lateran Council decreed, must be suspect of heresy.⁶¹ Subsequently the canonist Henry of Segusia (d. 1271) declared that "whoever contradicted or refused to accept the decretals of the pope was a heretic."⁶²

The high point of Catholic attacks on the Cathari began about 1230 with the production of detailed, systematic, scholastic analyses of anti-Christian and unorthodox practices. But already in 1215 the famous confession of faith had been directed almost sentence for sentence against them. Attendance at the Eucharist (even as in the seventeenth century in the Lord's Supper in accordance with the prescriptions of the Anglican church) was required as an annual affirmation of the loyalty test (baptism) to distinguish conformity to the body politic from subversion. Confession to the *sacerdos proprius* at least once a year was designed as a disciplinary measure and to strengthen a weak link in the penitential chain.⁶³ Such endorsement of parochial authority as the cornerstone of spiritual activity had to be renewed against the encroachment of the mendicant orders.

Conscience suffered the same restrictions as limb and property. Difficult as it is to disentangle the details, it would appear that the commercial class contributed to the lifting of restraint on conscience, as it would again in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries work against property restrictions and private initiative. Although inquisitors must be judged on individual merits, the inquisitorial tribunal, operating behind closed doors and without providing adequate defense for the accused, could become the tool of the demagogue or fanatic, who exploits

ignorance, prejudice, and fears when social stability and moral well-being depend on heretic-hunting and soul-saving. Similarly, casuists—polemicists, canonists, and inquisitors—not only shortened current judicial procedure but extended and enlarged the concept of heresy to include other crimes the tribunal could prosecute.

As the first prerequisite for constraint in religion, the persecutor believes that he is right. The church never admitted any uncertainty as to its cardinal affirmations. The faithful were all arbitrarily citizens of the *respublica Christiana*, the church-state; outside of it there was no promise of salvation. Whereas excommunication and interdict jeopardized the rights of citizenship, enrolment in the crusade army was the highest act of patriotism. According to the doctrine of predestination the salvation of souls was predetermined by God. Thus for the Calvinist the purpose of persecution was not to alter God's decrees but to vindicate His honor.⁶⁴ If man is to save himself through his own will, the safeguards against temptation must be all the higher. The doctrine of predestination at this point became a weapon of liberty, on the ground that if man's salvation depends wholly on God, then constraint is futile.

The church came to regard heresy as the most serious offense because rejection of creed and withdrawal from the organization spelled damnation. Likewise attack upon the hierarchy was in itself anti-social since it tended to the weakening or destruction of existing institutions and carried with it the germs of a lessening of respect for all constitutional authority. Even in the ante-Nicene period the heretic was described as a spiritual adulterer, a ravager of the bride of Christ, a fox in the vineyard of the Lord, and Antichrist. The revival of Roman law emphasized the juridical concept that it was the duty of the state to protect true religion and to punish heretics as enemies of society.⁶⁵ "If the temporal lord," runs one of Frederick II's Constitutions, "required and admonished by the church, fails to purge his land of heretical pravity, after a year of admonition the forfeited land ought to be occupied by Catholics."⁶⁶ Counterfeiting of divine truth, declared Thomas Aquinas, is worse than the forging of money which is punishable by death.⁶⁷ Obedience to law and dogma was exacted against conscience to ensure political stability. It was a legal right colliding with moral law.

For Innocent III and Frederick II heresy was worse than treason because it is more serious to offend divine law than temporal majesty.⁶⁸ The pope, in a bull of September 23, 1207, legislated against Patarins, but he took care to point out that no heretic, no matter what the nature of his error might be, should be allowed to escape the full penalty of the law.⁶⁹ To render discrimination difficult, names were often un-

consciously equated or conveniently confused in official as well as popular thinking with labels applied to persons and associations already suspected of heterodoxy. St. Paul had pronounced a curse upon all who taught the Galatians what he labeled false gospel (Gal. 1, 8). How often, in medieval polemic and prophecy, does one hear of pseudo-preachers or false prophets! Yet Etienne de Bourdon and St. Bernard's correspondent Erwin, provost of Steinfeld,⁷⁰ were embarrassed by the honesty, moral integrity, and diligence of these men. For beguines and beghards such confusion, deliberate or otherwise, was a natural consequence of rapid growth in the absence of uniform rule and the irrevocable triple vow. But testifying to elasticity even during persecution of the Spiritual Franciscans, the papal curia, after the Council of Vienne, exhorted the bishops of the Rhineland and the Low Countries to examine closely and to rehabilitate these extraregulars wherever possible.⁷¹

Whereas doctrinal heresy was satisfactorily handled through existing channels, popular disaffection posed extraordinary problems. After a generation of contraction which had rejected the Waldensians and cast aspersions on the Humiliati at the Third Lateran Council (1179) and Verona (1184), the apostolic movement returned to the church and blossomed forth under Innocent III with greater proselytism than ever. Not the least of the merits of his pontificate was tact and moderation to restore the ministry of souls by recognizing legitimate religious claims and wherever feasible to lead dissidents back to the fold. Since the Cathari opposed to Rome an uncompromising unchristian church it is understandable why Innocent feared them more than Islam. Yet he knew only too well that the austerity of the Perfect was an answer to the cumulation of benefices, the apathy of the bishops, the general relaxation of clerical mores.⁷² In a letter to the bishop of Verona (December 7, 1199) the pope expressed regret that the archpriest of this town had assimilated Cathari, Arnoldists, Poor Men of Lyons, and Humiliati without making the distinction that the last named were not heretics. Since they served God "in the humility of their heart and body," the pastor must neither condemn the innocent nor absolve the guilty.⁷³

Imbued with Gregorian zeal Innocent set out to authorize and make permanent in the Catholic world the objectives of the wandering preacher. The appeal of the popular religious movement could not be denied. Its resources must be tapped as a counterpoise to the Cathari. Although marred by the Albigensian crusade, the policy of conciliation achieved some success. Two groups of Waldensians—Durandus de Huesca (1208)⁷⁴ and Bernard Primus (1210) returned to the fold, received a rule from the pope and formed new congregations. The first were known as Poor Catholics (*Pauperes Catholici*) to offset the Poor

Men of Lyons (*Pauperes de Lugduno*). They too practiced evangelical poverty but within the Catholic framework. Through such disputations as the one held at Pamiers (1207) the church sought to win back the dissenter by persuasion. But how far the pope was inspired before Diego and Dominic is not known.⁷⁵ Certainly they helped to reorient papal policy by espousing itinerant preaching like the dissenter without the splendor and might of the hierarchy and by living like the heretic, but teaching like the church. However much Innocent III might advise, order, and threaten, he was nevertheless unable to put life into the followers of Durandus. They merely prepared the way for the friars. How much more successful the Humiliati, recently reconciled to the Roman cura,⁷⁶ were in defense of the church is eloquently described by Jacques de Vitry. These brethren, both clerics and educated laymen, he pointed out, "have from the pope the power to preach not only in their own congregation, but in town squares and parish churches with episcopal consent." In his incomparable letter of October, 1216 he presented both the Humiliati and Friars Minor as a matchless bulwark against heresy. Just a few weeks before the bishop of Acre had personally secured at least verbal approbation from Honorius III for the feminine religious movement in Belgium.⁷⁷ What he thought that would mean to the church can best be understood from his description of the jubilation of Foulques of Toulouse. This hard-pressed bishop "could not admire enough the faith and reverence of the *mulieres religiosae* in the diocese of Liège who exhibited profound respect for the church and its sacraments in contrast to his own country where they were scorned and ignored by almost everybody."⁷⁸

Herein lies a prophecy of curial policy with regard to Belgian beguines as one fruitful example of the extraregular. During the golden age of the beguinage, which extended from the middle of the thirteenth century through the pontificate of Clement V and even beyond adverse Clementine legislation, the French and Flemish-Dutch beguines received praise and recommendations from local prelates and the Roman curia, donations and legacies from noblemen and burghers, and comital, ducal, echevinal and royal protection, patronage, privileges, and exemptions customarily accorded religious congregations. Although willing to give its stamp of approval to the beguinages as a worthy work deserving of indulgences and protection and even countenancing their growth, the hierarchy nevertheless was not in general directly responsible for establishing these houses.⁷⁹ Nor did this feminine religious movement, in spite of papal recognition and the erection of beguine parishes under spiritual directors drawn at first from older monastic bodies and eventually from the friars, ever enjoy in the medieval period the status of an officially recognized religious order, regulated by the triple vow and uniform statutes. Distinctive habit and profession of chastity, while

setting the inmates apart from the world,⁸⁰ did not confer true religious status. Nor did they, like the mendicants, in the main voluntarily subscribe to poverty; observance of the Pauline injunction to work remained consistently a prerequisite for the *vita apostolica*. While lack of status laid them open, like tertiaries, to curtailment of privileges by civil authority and guild overseers,⁸¹ they, like the Humiliati, owed their livelihood in large measure to the wool industry. If the beguinages did not seek unity and discipline through congregational organization, the beguine parish remained an effective answer to the dangers inherent in autonomy. Failure to identify oneself with the approved community involved exclusion from beguine association and the loss of special privileges.

In conclusion, the thirteenth century was an age of scepticism and faith, discussion and constraint, spirituality and secularism, diversity and unity. But religious liberty, freedom of conscience, depends on division of interest, not mere diversity of method. The church, unlike certain sects, could be elastic and inclusive. Sacrament might be wider than election. The demands of the *vita apostolica* charted the path of both reform and rebellion. Yet honest dissent was obstructed by that fundamental premise which responded only to calculations of expediency. As papal wars against internal enemies grew in number, hostility to such intra-Christian strife increased. Dante exploded before Boniface VIII's policies: "It is not against the infidel, Saracens or Jews that the chief of the modern Pharisees leaves for war; he has enemies only among the Christians."⁸²

1. Pierre Mandonnet, M. H. Vicaire, R. Ladner, *Saint Dominique, l'idée, l'homme et l'oeuvre*, II (Paris, 1937), 167-192; L. J. M. Philippen, *Het Ontstaan der Begijnhoven* (Antwerp, 1943), pp. 15-30; id., "Les béguines et l'hérésie Albigeoise," *Annales de l'Académie royale d'archéologie de Belgique*, LXXIII (1926), 233-252; Aleantara Mens, *Oorsprong en Betekenis van de nederlandse Begijnen-en Begardenbeweging, vergelijkende Studie: XIIde-XIIIde eeuw* (Antwerp, 1947), pp. 16-96; Stephanus Axters, *Geschiedenis van de Vroomheid in de Nederlanden. I. De Vroomheid tot rond het jaar 1300* (Antwerp, 1950), pp. 206ff; J. C. Dickinson, *The Origins of the Austin Canons and their Introduction into England* (London, 1950), pp. 7-90; Charles Dereine, "Vie commune, règle de Saint Augustin et chanoines réguliers au XIe siècle," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XLI (1946), 365-406; id., *Les chanoines réguliers au diocèse de Liège avant Saint Norbert* (Mémoires de l'Académie royale de Belgique, t.

XLVII, Brussels, 1952), pp. 15-54; M. D. Chenu, "Moines, clercs, laïcs au carrefour de la vie évangélique (XIIe siècle)," *RHE.*, XLIX (1954), 59-89; Herbert Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen im Mittelalter: Untersuchungen über die geschichtlichen Zusammenhänge zwischen der Ketzerei, den Bettelorden und der religiösen Frauenbewegung im 12. und 13. Jahrhundert und über die geschichtlichen Grundlagen der deutschen Mystik* (Historische Studien, Hft. 267) (Berlin, 1935), pp. 13-38; E. W. McDonnell, *Beguines and Beghards in Medieval Culture with special Reference to the Belgian Scene* (Rutgers University Press, 1954), pp. 8-79, 141-153; Henri van Rooijen, *Theodorus van Celles, een tijds- en levensbeeld* (Cuyk, 1936).

2. J. Wirges, *Die Anfänge der Augustiner Chorherren und die Gründung des Augustiner Chorherrenstiftes Ravensburg* (Betzdorf, 1928), pp. 130-134; Ursmer Berlière, *L'ascèse bénédictine des origines à la fin du XIIe siècle, essai historique* (Paris-Bruges, 1927),

- pp. 250-264; McDonnell, *op. cit.*, pp. 141-153.
3. Mandonnet, *Saint Dominique*, II, 167-192; Chenu, *Moines*, p. 69.
 4. Peter Damian, *Contra Clericos Regulares Proprietarios*, *PL.*, 145, 490.
 5. Bull, *Quorundam*, cited by G. G. Coulton, *Inquisition and Liberty* (London-Toronto, 1938), p. 219.
 6. Rupert of Deutz, *De vita vere apostolica*, iv, 4 (*PL.*, 170, 644): "Si vis omnia Scripturarum consulere testimonia, nihil aliud videntur dicere quam Ecclesiam inchoasse a vita monastica"; cf. iii, 15 (*ibid.*, 641f).
 7. *Liber de diversis ordinibus et professionibus quae sunt in ecclesia*, *PL.*, 213, 809.
 8. *PL.*, 151, 338-339.
 9. Arno Borst, *Die Katharer (Schriften der Monumenta Germaniae Historica)*, vol. XII, Stuttgart, 1953, pp. 96-101, 110-111; Dmitri Obolensky, *The Bogomils. A Study in Balkan Neo-Manichaeism* (Cambridge University Press, 1948), pp. 245, 288-289.
 10. Guido Bondatti, *Giochismo e Francescanesimo nel Duecento* (S. Maria degli Angeli, 1924); Francesco Foberti, *Gioacchino da Fiore. Nuovi Studi critici sulla mistica e la religiosità in Calabria* (Firenze, 1934).
 11. Decima Douie, *The Nature and the Effect of the Heresy of the Fraticelli* (Cambridge University Press, 1932), pp. 11-15, 81-119.
 12. George William Greenaway, *Arnold of Brescia* (Cambridge University Press, 1931); Elie Vacandard, *Vie de Saint Bernard, abbé de Clairvaux*, II (Paris, 1927), 235-258, 465-469.
 13. Austin P. Evans, "Social Aspects of Medieval Heresy," in *Persecution and Liberty, Essays in Honor of G. D. Burr* (New York, 1931), pp. 93-116.
 14. "Monachus non doctoris, sed plangetis habet officium." Cf. John Cassian, *Collationes*, xvii, 5 (*PL.*, 49, 1094-1100).
 15. Richard Wilder Emery, *Heresy and Inquisition in Narbonne* (Columbia University Press, 1941). See his explanation for the failure of heresy to develop in Narbonne in spite of "good" conditions. Cf. John Hine Mundy, *Liberty and Political Power in Toulouse, 1050-1230* (Columbia University Press, 1954).
 16. Achille Luchaire, *Innocent III. Rome et l'Italie* (Paris, 1907), pp. 84-91.
 17. Rupert of Deutz, *De vita vere apostolica*, II, 15, *PL.*, 170, 631-32.
 18. *Vita A. S. Norberti*, *MGH. SS.*, XII, 683.
 19. Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen*, pp. 70ff; Mandonnet, *Saint Dominique*, II, 183-192; G. de Lagarde, *Naissance de l'esprit laïque au déclin du moyen âge. I. Bilan du XIII^e siècle* (Paris, 1948); J. R. Strayer, "The Laicization of French and English Society in the Thirteenth Century," *Speculum*, XV (1940), 76-86.
 20. Jean Béthune, *Cartulaire du béguinage de Sainte-Elisabeth à Gand* (Bruges, 1893), p. 74; cf. McDonnell, *op. cit.*, p. 83.
 21. Grundman, *Religiöse Bewegungen*, pp. 157-169; 188ff; Mens, "Innerlijke drijfveeren en herkomst der kettersche bewegingen in de Middeleeuwen. Religiens ofwel sociaal oogmerk?" *Miscellanea historica in honorem Leonis van der Essen*, I, 299-313.
 22. McDonnell, *op. cit.*, pp. 81f.
 23. *Ibid.*, pp. 85-100.
 24. Mens, *Oorsprong*, pp. 323-402; Otmar Doerr, *Das Institut der Inklusen in Süddeutschland* (Münster i. Westf., 1934).
 25. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, II, 2, q. 188, art. 3.
 26. *PL.*, 151, 336.
 27. Bernold, *Chronicon MGH. SS.*, V, 452-453, ad an. 1091.
 28. Alberie de Trois-Fontaines, *Chron.*, *MGH. SS.*, XXIII, 855.
 29. Pomerius, *Vita Ruysb.*, *Analecta Bollandiana*, IV (1885), 288.
 30. McDonnell, *op. cit.*, pp. 20, 34-35, 97, 145, 150, 312-14, 416, 434.
 31. *Vita A. S. Norberti*, *MGH. SS.*, XII, 683.
 32. C. Lambot, "Saint Augustin a-t-il rédigé la règle pour moines qui porte son nom?" *Revue bénédictine*, LIII (1941), 41-58; id., "Règle de S. Augustin," *Dictionnaire de droit canonique*, I (Paris, 1935), coll. 1412-16; J. Besse, in *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique*, I, 2 (Paris, 1911), 2472-2483; F. Bonnard, in *Dictionnaire d'histoire et de géographie ecclésiastique*, V (Paris, 1934), 494-498. Mandonnet, *Saint Dominique*, II, 103-162.
 33. Léon Le Grand, *Statuts d'Hôtels-Dieu et de léproseries. Recueil de textes du XII^e au XIV^e siècle* (Paris, 1901), pp. vff.
 34. Dereine, "Vie commune, règle de Saint Augustin et chanoines réguliers au XI^e siècle," *Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique*, XLI (1946), 365-406; id., "Les coutumiers de St. Quentin de Beauvais et de Springiersbach," *ibid.*, XLIII (1948), 411-442; id., "Les origines de Prémontré," *ibid.*, XLII (1947), 352-378; id., "L'élaboration du statut canonique des chanoines réguliers spécialement sous Urbain II," *ibid.*, XLVI (1951), 534-565; id., "Chanoines," *DHGE.*, XII (1953), 353-404; id., "Le problème de la vie commune chez les canonistes, d'Anselme de Lucques à Gratien," *Studi Gregoriani*, III (Rome, 1948), 287-298; id., "Le premier ordo de Prémontré," *Revue bénédictine*, LVIII (1948), 84-92; id., "Enquête sur la règle de S. Augustin," *Scriptorium*, II (1948), 27-36; id., "Con-

- tumiers et ordinaires de chanoines réguliers," *ibid.*, V (1951), 107-113; id., *Chanoines réguliers au diocèse de Liège*, pp. 9-103; G. Bardy, *Saint Grégoire VII et la réforme canoniale au XI^e siècle*, *Studi Gregoriani*, I (1947), 47-64; A. Brackmann, "Gregor VII. und die kirchliche Reformbewegung in Deutschland," *ibid.*, II (1947), 7-30; Chenu, *Moines*, pp. 59-75; Ludwig Fischer, "Ivo von Chartres, der Erneuer der Vita canonica in Frankreich," in *Festgabe Alois Knöpfer* (Freiburg i. Br., 1917), pp. 67-88; Th. Heijman, "Norbertainer vroomheid in de Nederlanden," *Ons Geestelijk Erf*, IV (1930), 298-315; Ludwig Hertling, "Kanoniker, Augustinusregel und Augustinerorden," *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, LIV (1930), 335-359; K. Hofmann, "Der 'Dictatus papae' Gregors VII. als Index einer Kanonessammlung?" *Studi Gregoriani*, I (1947), 531-537; Jean Leclercq, "Documents pour l'histoire des chanoines réguliers," *RHE.*, XLIV (1949), 556-569; Georg Schreiber, "Religiöse Verbände in mittelalterlicher Wertung lateinischer Westen und griechischer Osten," *Historisches Jahrbuch*, LXII-LXIX (1942-49), pp. 284-358; id., "Praemonstratenser Kultur des XII. Jahrhunderts," *Analecta Praemonstratensia*, XVI (1940), 41-107; id., "Zur theologischen Prämonstratenserliteratur des 12. Jahrhunderts," *ibid.*, XVII (1941), 5-33; id., "Studien über Anselm von Havelberg. Zur Geistesgeschichte des Hochmittelalters," *ibid.*, XVIII (1942), 5-90; id., *Gemeinschaften des Mittelalters, Recht und Verfassung, Kult und Frömmigkeit* (Regensburg-Münster, 1948), pp. 397ff; P. Schroeder, "Die Augustiner Chorherrenregel. Entstehung, kritischer Text und Einführung der Regel," *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, IX (1926), 271-306; P. Torquebian, "Chanoines," *DDC.*, III., 471-488; "Chapitres de chanoines," *ibid.*, 530-566.
35. Council of Rheims (1131), Mansi, XXI, 459, can. 6; Second Lateran Council (1139), *ibid.*, 528, can. 9; can. 26 (*ibid.*, 532-33) adds the rule of Basil.
36. Cf. Nicholas II's letter to the bishops of Gaul, Aquitaine, and Gascony in 1059 (Mansi, XIX, 873-74); Council of Rome (1063), *ibid.*, 1025, can. 4. However, "common life" is susceptible of many degrees, from simple grouping in a cloister to putting in common all resources (Wirges, p. 51); Dereine, in *RHE.*, XLI (1946), 388-89.
37. Dereine, "Saint-Ruf et ses coutumes aux XI^e et XII^e siècles," *Revue bénédictine*, LIX (1949), 161-182; Dickinson, *Origins*, pp. 180f.
38. Dereine, "Chanoines," *DHGE.*, XII, 389-391; *RB.*, LVIII (1948), 84-92.
39. McDonnell, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
40. E. g., *Vita A. S. Norberti*, *MGH. SS.*, XII, 683.
41. Schreiber, in *Anal. Praem.*, XVI (1940), 41-107; XVIII (1942), 5-90; Watkin Williams, "A Dialogue between a Cluniac and a Cistercian," in *Monastic Studies* (Manchester University Press, 1938), 61-74; Dickinson, *Origins*, pp. 197-223.
42. Dereine, in *DHGE.*, XII, 377.
43. To correct the instability which plagued early canonical communities Urban II took decisive steps. In the privilege addressed about 1095 to the abbot of St. Rufus he stipulated that "nemo alicuius levitatus instinctu vel districtioris religionis obtentu ex eodem claustrum audent sine abbatis totiusque congregationis permissione discedere." This formula, with the clause *vel districtioris religionis obtentu* which gives it originality, received wide currency in subsequent papal correspondence (e.g., Calixtus II, J. v. Pflugk-Harttung, *Acta Pontificum Romanorum Inedita* II (Tübingen, 1881), 319).
44. *Liber de ordine canonicorum*, *PL.* 188, 1111.
45. *Ibid.*, 1141.
46. *Ibid.*, 1141.
47. *Ibid.*, 1141-43; cf. Odericus Vitalis, *Hist. eccl.*, pars III, l. 8, c. 25, *PL.* 188, 636-642; *Vita A. S. Norberti*, *MGH. SS.*, XII, 683.
48. Chenu, *Moines*, p. 77.
49. McDonnell, *op. cit.*, pp. 20-39, 107-09, 154-57.
50. Can. 13, Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles*, V, 2, 1344.
51. Can. 23, *ibid.*, VI, 1, 201-202.
52. Thomas Aquinas, *ST.*, II, 2, qq. 10, art. 8; 11, art. 2; Jacques de Vitry, *Sermones Vulgares*, Paris, Bib. nat., fonds lat. 17,509, f. 30; for importance of overt acts see Innocent III, Ep. XII, 154 (1209). Cf. Albert Clement Shannon, *The Popes and Heresy in the Thirteenth Century* (Augustinian Press, Villanova, Penn., 1949), p. 4.
53. Roland H. Bainton, *The Travail of Religious Liberty. Nine Biographical Studies* (Philadelphia, 1951), pp. 19-20.
54. *Ad Scapulam*, II, *PL.*, I, 699.
55. *Dialogus Miraculorum*, iv, 15, ed. Joseph Strange, Cologne, (1851), I, 188.
56. *Verbum Abbreviatum*, *PL.* 205, 230.
57. Elle Vacandard, *The Inquisition*, trans. Bertrand L. Conway (New York, 1924), pp. 124-127.
58. *Inferno*, canto. xix (trans. Carlyle-Wicksteed).
59. Michel Villey, *La croisade, essai sur la formation d'une théorie juridique* (Paris, 1942).
60. *Registrum II*, 55 a, ed. Caspar, 201ff.
61. Can. 3, Hefele-Leclercq, V, 2, 1330ff.
62. Vacandard, *Inquisition*, p. 117.
63. Fourth Lateran Council, can. 21, Hefele-Leclercq, V, 2, 1349f.

64. Bainton, *op. cit.*, pp. 17ff.
65. Vacandard, *Inquisition*, pp. 8ff, 50ff; according to the Council of Avignon (1209), can. 2: "secundum canonicas et legitimas sanctiones" (Mansi, XXII, 786).
66. November 22, 1220, *MGH. Legum*, II, 109.
67. *ST.* II, 2, q. 11, art. 3.
68. XI, 1 (March 25, 1199), *PL* 214, 539 B; February 22, 1232 and March, 1232, *MGH. Legum*, II, 195, 197.
69. X, 130, *PL* 215, 1226f.
70. Raoul Manselli, *Studia sulle eresie del secolo XII* (Rome, 1953), pp. 89-110; Philippen, *Het Ontstaan der Begijnhoven*, pp. 23-29.
71. McDonnell, *op. cit.*, pp. 539-556.
72. III, 24, *PL* 214, 903-05.
73. II, 228, *ibid.*, 788.
74. Johann Baptist Pierron, *Die Katholischen Armen, ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Bettelorden mit Berücksichtigung der Humiliaten und der wiedervereinigten Lombarden* (Freiburg i. Br., 1911), pp. 22-51; Grundmann, *Religiöse Bewegungen*, pp. 72ff.
75. Borst, *Katharer*, p. 117, n. 28.
76. *PL* 214, 789.
77. McDonnell, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-35.
78. *Vita Mariae Oigniacensis*, *AA. SS.*, XXV (June 23, v), 547 (2).
79. McDonnell, *op. cit.*, pp. 154-164.
80. *Ibid.*, pp. 120-140.
81. *Ibid.*, pp. 270-279.
82. *Inferno*, xxvii.

DENOMINATIONALISM AS A BASIS FOR ECUMENICITY: A SEVENTEENTH CENTURY CONCEPTION*

WINTHROP S. HUDSON, *Colgate-Rochester Divinity School*

The use of the word "denomination" to describe a religious group came into vogue during the early years of the Evangelical Revival. Typical of the mood which gave currency to the new term are John Wesley's oft-quoted words; "I . . . refuse to be distinguished from other men by any but the common principles of Christianity. . . . I renounce and detest all other marks of distinction. But from real Christians, *of whatever denomination*, I earnestly desire not to be distinguished at all. . . . Dost thou love and fear God? It is enough! I give thee the right hand of fellowship."¹ The word "denomination" was adopted by the leaders of the Evangelical Revival, both in England and America, because it was a neutral term which carried with it no implication of a negative value judgment.²

Denominationalism is the opposite of sectarianism. The word "denomination" implies that the group referred to is but one member of a larger group, called or denominated by a particular name. The basic contention of the denominational theory of the church is that the true church is not to be identified in any exclusive sense with any particular ecclesiastical institution. The outward forms of worship and organization are at best but differing attempts to give visible expression to the life of the church in the life of the world. No denomination claims to represent the whole church of Christ. No denomination claims that all other churches are false churches. No denomination claims that all members of society should be incorporated within its own membership. No denomination claims that the whole of society and the state should submit to its ecclesiastical regulations. Yet all denominations recognize their responsibility for the whole of society and they expect to cooperate in freedom and mutual respect with other denominations in discharging that responsibility.

The denominational theory of the church was popularized by the leaders of the eighteenth century awakening, but it was a theory which had been hammered out by a group of Puritan divines in the preceding century and which had won sufficiently widespread acceptance so that its theological justification could largely be taken for granted. As a consequence, the Evangelical leaders were not compelled to construct a systematic defense of the conception of the church which was common

*Read at a session of the American Society of Church History in New York City, December 29, 1954.

to them all. To discover their fundamental presuppositions, which they betray only in incidental remarks and observations, one must go back to the seventeenth century divines who first formulated the denominational theory of the church.

Actually, the denominational theory of the church was implicit in the thinking of the Protestant Reformers. The true church, they affirmed, is not an institution, although in the life of the world it must assume institutional form. But the church must not and cannot be identified in any exclusive sense with any particular institution. There are many, John Calvin confessed, who "are not satisfied unless the church can always be pointed out with the finger." But, said he, that is something that cannot be done in any final sense. The whole question as to the dimensions, the boundaries, the limits of the church of Christ must be left to God, "since he alone 'knoweth them that are his.'"³ Thus the Reformers recognized as true churches all churches which possessed an essentially common faith, whether they were Lutheran churches as in Germany and Scandinavia; Reformed churches as in Switzerland, Holland, and Scotland, or an Anglican church as in England. All these churches in their various geographical areas were different manifestations of the whole church of Christ which embraced them all.

The new element which was to be introduced into this type of thinking was the application of the basic convictions of the Reformers to a situation in which religious diversity existed within a particular geographical area rather than between different geographical areas. Formerly it had been a question as to whether or not a church in England could be and was in communion with a church in Holland. The answer of Protestantism in general had been that they both could be and were in communion with one another. In seventeenth century England, it was to be suggested that this was equally true of Anglican, Presbyterian, Congregational, and Baptist churches when they were located on opposite corners in the same city. Each could be and should be regarded as constituting a different "mode" of expressing in piety, thought, and organization that larger life of the church in which they all shared.

I.

The real architects of the denominational theory of the church were the seventeenth century Independent divines within the Church of England, whose most prominent representatives were the Dissenting Brethren in the Westminster Assembly. The initial concern of the Independents some decades before had been to carry out a liturgical reformation that would make the worship of the church express more adequately and convey more clearly the fundamental theological con-

victions they held concerning the nature and the implications of the Christian faith. Unfortunately an increasing pressure to secure liturgical conformity made it progressively more difficult for these men to maintain the liturgical reforms which they had introduced in their parishes and pushed them in the direction of Separatism. Yet, even when the force of circumstance compelled them to establish a separate worship, they were unwilling to adopt the Separatist contention that the conforming churches were to be disowned as false churches, and they continued to maintain communion, so far as they were able, with their former parish churches. Of one of their leaders, William Bradshaw, it was said: "He had learned Christ better than for difference of opinion in such points to make schisms and divisions, as their [the Separatists'] manner is, with all those that do not in all things concur with them and subscribe to what they say."⁴ The worship and even the government of the conforming churches might be defective and corrupt to varying degrees, but to regard them as false churches without any valid ordinances and devoid of true Christians would be to divide the body of Christ, to unchurch the martyrs of former generations (such as Cranmer, Ridley, Latimer, and Hooper), and to run counter to one of the deepest convictions of the Independents concerning the economy of Christ in the life of the world.

During the early sessions of the Westminster Assembly, the Dissenting Brethren had objected to the establishment of a national church on a Presbyterian model. Charged with being obstructionists, they sought to justify their position by issuing *An Apologetical Narration*. There were two major principles, they asserted, upon which they had proceeded in their thinking concerning the outward arrangements of the church.

"The supreme rule," which they had followed, ". . . was the primitive pattern and example of the churches created by the Apostles."⁵ They are willing to concede, as Henry Burton was later to acknowledge, that "no such model is left in the New Testament as was given to Moses in the Old;"⁶ yet they could not "but imagine that Christ hath ever been as exact in setting forth the true bounds and limits of whatever portion of power he hath imparted unto any (if we of this age could attain rightly to discern it) as he hath been in ordering what kind of censures and for what sins, . . . which we find he hath been punctual in."⁷

When they had gone into exile abroad, they had been forced to inquire into the positive part of church government, and they believed that this circumstance of being completely on their own had served to free them from bias and thus had allowed them to search out the pattern of the primitive church impartially, being guided only by the "light and touch" of God's Spirit.

We had, of all men, the greatest reason to be true to our own consciences in what we should embrace, seeing it was for our conscience that we were deprived at once of whatever was dear to us. We had no new commonwealths to rear to frame church government unto . . . to cause the least variation by us from the primitive pattern. We had no state-ends or political interests to comply with; no kingdoms in our eye to subdue to our mold . . . ; no preferments or worldly respects to shape our opinion for. We had nothing else to do but simply and singly to consider how to worship God acceptably and so most accordingly to his Word.⁸

"Although we cannot profess that sufficiency of knowledge as to be able to lay forth all those rules therein . . . , yet we found principles enough, . . . to us clear and certain, and such as might well serve to preserve our churches in peace and from offense and would comfortably guide us to heaven in a safe way."⁹

The second principle upon which they had proceeded "was not to make our present judgment and practice a binding law unto ourselves for the future."

We had too great an instance for our own frailty in the former way of our conformity, and therefore . . . we kept this reserve . . . to alter and retract (though not lightly) whatever should be discovered to be taken up out of a misunderstanding of the rule.¹⁰

The keeping of a "reserve to alter and retract" is reflected again and again in the writings of the Independents. The elders of the churches in New England in 1639, responding to an inquiry concerning their practice, had phrased it thus:

We see as much cause to suspect the integrity of our own hearts as yours; and so much the more, as being more privy to the deceitfulness of our own hearts than to yours . . . , which causeth us with great reverence to accept and receive what further light God may be pleased to impart unto us by you. But as we have believed, so have we hitherto practiced. . . . If anything appear to be unsound, and dissonant from the Word, which we for our parts cannot discern, we shall willingly attend to what further light God may send unto us by you.¹¹

In the same year, the anonymous author of *The Saints' Apology* had written in similar vein:

I have in my plain way endeavored to express my judgment in these particulars, desiring to be always ready to open mine eyes to receive further light from whomsoever it shall be showed unto me. In the meantime, I must walk according to that I have. . . . If there be any begged principles or grounds wanting proof or anything inferred from grounds too weak to maintain the same . . . , make that appear unto me, and I shall either make them good . . . (at least to my apprehension or quit them).¹²

Thomas Hooker put it even more vividly when he wrote:

My only aim . . . is to lay down . . . the grounds of our practice according to that measure of light I have received. . . . The sum is, we doubt not what we practice, but it's beyond all doubt that all men are

liars and we are in the number of those poor feeble men; either we do or may err, though we do not know it; what we have learned we do profess, and yet profess still to live that we may learn.

Hooker's hope was that he "might occasion men eminently gifted to make further search and to dig deeper that, if there be any vein of reason which lies yet lower, it might be brought to light." "We profess and promise," he continued, "not only a ready ear to hear it, but a heart willing to welcome it."¹³

It was this type of thinking which led the Independents to oppose the establishment of a national church on a Presbyterian model. They felt certain, as Henry Burton declared, that they could "prove our way with all our practices in every particular out of God's Word," and they also felt sure that this the others could not do.¹⁴ Yet, knowing the deceit that lurked within their own hearts, they were aware that they might be wrong. Thus they objected not only to the Presbyterian claim that the system of church government which they proposed was *jure divino* but were equally unwilling to make such a claim for their own proposals.¹⁵

Beyond this fundamental disagreement as to the extent to which divine sanction could be claimed for a particular ecclesiastical structure, the difference between the two parties was not great. Charles Herle, a moderate Presbyterian, summarized the difference in this fashion:

Our difference 'tis such as doth at most but ruffle a little the fringe, not any way rend the garment of Christ. 'Tis so far from being a *fundamental* that 'tis scarce a *material* one. Nay not so much as the *form*. 'Tis but the better or worse way for the exercise of the same form of discipline that is in question. *That it be* and *What it be* and *Which it be* is agreed on amongst us. 'Tis but the *Whose it be* we differ in, and herein not so much *Whose* neither, as *Where it be*, whether in every congregation apart or of the same men joined with the like of other congregations in a synod?¹⁶

The specific issue around which the controversy centered was where the power of the keys—the power to excommunicate and deliver unto Satan—was to reside. The one thing which their experience had taught the Independents was that the authority of the church could be utilized by men to hinder and obstruct God's people from yielding full obedience to God's will as it had been made known to them. This possibility they wished to reduce to a minimum.

One cannot escape the feeling, as one reads the literature of the time, that the Independents regarded the act of excommunication as involving, in the last analysis, an act of intolerable presumption on the part of those called upon to judge, but they could not deny its obvious Scriptural warrant. They could find in Scripture, however, no basis for a synod having the authority to deliver anyone to Satan, and they

were convinced that it was highly dangerous to grant such power to such a body. Consequently, they insisted that if a person was to receive that dreadful sentence, it should be pronounced by those who knew him, by the members of his own congregation, and not by a distant tribunal dependent solely upon second-hand reports of his character, conduct, and opinions. Even those threatened with the lesser penalties of civil tribunals, they pointed out, could claim the right to be judged in their own community by a jury of their peers.

As the discussions continued it became clear that the Independents would be content with an accommodation which would permit them to follow the leading of God's Spirit as it was disclosed to them in Scripture.

I shall tell you in a word what will content all the Independents in England. 'Tis this: They desire neither more nor less than what the Puritans desired of Queen Elizabeth and King James; *vis.* an entire exemption from the jurisdiction of all prelates and ecclesiastical officers other than such as themselves shall choose; . . . to be as free to choose their own company, place, and time, with whom, where, and when to worship God as they are in the choice of their wives; for a forced marriage will not hold.¹⁷

Or, as the Dissenting Brethren phrased the demand: "If in a parish it happen there be a considerable number of such as cannot partake in the sacraments with the minister and people, they shall have liberty to dispose of themselves as a distinct church and to choose a minister or ministers at their own charge to be maintained, to be their pastor."¹⁸ This, in essence, had been the Independent position from the beginning. Henry Jacob had written years before:

We believe concerning mixtures of the open profane with some godly Christians in a visible church, though at once it doth not destroy essentially nor make void the holiness of that whole assembly, yet truly it putteth that whole assembly into a most dangerous and desperate estate . . . by such extreme peril of further infection. . . . Insomuch that what soul soever in such a church state desireth to be in safety ought with all diligence to leave that spiritual society . . . and join to a better, seeing under the gospel there are more free societies of Christians, more visible churches politic, than one in a country, and some more sincere than some. . . . We ought to leave the worse society and to enjoy one that is and may be sincere.¹⁹

This meant, as Jeremiah Burroughes readily acknowledged, that "we must grant that liberty to our brethren we would have ourselves."²⁰

II

There were good theological reasons for the Independents to adopt the position that men should be as free in the choice of the forms of worship as they are in the choice of their wives.

Jeremiah Burroughes, the most influential spokesman of the Dis-

senting Brethren, pointed out that there always had been divisions in the church and that, "so long as we live here in this muddy world," there will continue to be divisions even among the godly. "If we consider things wisely," he suggested, "we have no cause to wonder that godly men in this their estate of imperfection should differ so much one from another as they do." There are several reasons for this:

First, every godly man prizes and seeks after knowledge. Others mind little but their own profit and pleasure. They trouble not themselves about knowing the things of God, except ambition puts them upon it. They care not which way truths go. But the godly man prizes every truth at a high rate, worth the contending for to the uttermost. In the dark, all colors be alike; but in the light, they appear diverse. . . . When men discuss things and desire to see farther in them, it is impossible, considering the weakness of the best and the variety of men's apprehensions, but there must needs to be much difference in men's judgments. And then, considering [that] their consciences are engaged in it, that everything they apprehend to be a truth (at least thus far) that they must not deny it for a world, this puts men's spirits at a distance although both be godly, both love the truth equally.

Secondly, godly men are free men. Christ made them so, and requires them not to suffer themselves to be brought under bondage. They must not, cannot submit their consciences to the opinions, determinations, decrees of any men living. They cannot submit to any as lords over their faith. This others can do. As for points of religion, say some, let the learned men judge of them; we will not be wiser than they; we will submit and others must submit to what they shall determine. This makes quick work of divisions, but this those who fear God cannot do. They must see everything they own as a truth with their own light . . . received from Jesus Christ. Though they reverence men of greater parts, deeper learning, yet they have the charge of Christ upon them not to acknowledge it as truth till they understand it to be so. This causes much contention among good men through their weakness and corruption of their hearts. . . . Thirdly, godly men give up themselves to the strictest rules of holiness. They walk in the narrow way of Christ. It is broad enough to the spiritual part, but in regard of our corruptions it is a narrow pent way. They dare not give way to themselves . . . to gratify others, . . . but must keep themselves to the straight rule. . . . Hence there is a clashing, everyone not having the same thoughts of the rule and way that others have. Those who walk by loose rules in ways that are broad . . . can suit themselves one to another easily. They can gratify their friends, yea, the corruptions of their friends, more than others can do. Godly men cannot yield for peace sake to such terms as other men can.

Fourthly, the things that the Saints are conversant about are great things, things of a high nature, about their last end, their eternal estate. Hence everyone is very chary and careful and strongly set to maintain what he apprehends. Those who understand not the infinite consequence of those things, who have not had the fear of them fall upon their hearts, they wonder at the stiffness of men's spirits that they can be brought to yield no more in such things than they conceive they might yield in. Where there are different apprehensions of those things that concern men's eternal estates, even among godly men, they must needs stand out one against the other, till God causes one of them to see things otherwise than he now doth.

Fifthly, the things of religion are hidden mysteries. They are the secrets of God. They are hard to be understood. God reveals them in a differing way. They are not ordinarily so clearly revealed but that the apprehensions of them are like to be different. . . .

Sixthly, the Saints are bound to watch over one another. Each is his brother's keeper. They ought to advise, admonish, reprove one another. . . . Now this, through our corruption, is very displeasing. We do not love to be meddled with, to be crossed in what we have a mind to. Other men can better preserve their own quiet by letting their brethren alone. . . . Hence it is that they many times live more quietly with one another than godly men do. Yet this is a great evil, a shame to those who are godly, that it should be so upon any terms.

Thus you see it is no wonder why there are dissensions among men that fear God.²¹

Several years earlier, William Bradshaw's editor had noted the lack of unanimity among the godly, pointing out that "it is well known that there is and hath been no small diversity of judgment between our nonconformists among themselves; some condemning some rites but allowing others, and some condemning those also which others allow; some esteeming the things simply evil in themselves, some only as inexpedient . . . ; some excepting against some passages in our liturgy which others of them stick not at; and the like." He then went on to observe that, "considering the wants and weaknesses that do ordinarily attend men's apprehensions . . . in such things as are not clearly evident of themselves, for a multitude of men of divers parts, abilities, dispositions, and endowments to concur and agree in every particular doubt or debate, question or controversy, . . . might justly be deemed rather a conspiracy than an uniformity of judgment."²²

While Burroughes readily acknowledged that the divisions among Christians were due to human weakness and sin, he also insisted that God makes use of them for his own purposes. In these divisions, "God is working out ends above our reach for his glory and the good of his Saints." For one thing, God uses these divisions for "the discovery of men's spirits that they which are approved may be made manifest."

The melting of the metal discovers the dross, for they divide the one from the other. These are melting times and thereby discovering times. If reformation had gone on without opposition, we had not seen what drossie spirits we had amongst us. Those who have kept upright without warping in these times are honorable before God.

God also uses these divisions to exercise the graces of his servants.

A little skill in a mariner is enough to guide his ship in fair weather; but when storms arise, where the seas swell and grow troublesome, then his skill is put to it. In these stormy troublesome times, there had need be much wisdom, faith, love, humility, patience, self-denial, meekness. All graces are put to it now! They had need put forth all their strength; act with all their vigor. Our graces had need be stirring, full of life and quickness, now! God prizeth the exercise of the graces of his Saints at a very high rate. He thinks it worth their suffering much trouble.

But above all, Burroughes asserts,

God hath a hand in these divisions to bring forth further light. Sparks are beaten out by the flints striking together. Many sparks of light, many truths, are beaten out by the beatings of men's spirits one against another. If light be let into a house, there must be some trouble to beat down [a place in the wall for] a window. A child thinks the house is beating down, but the father knows the light will be forth the cost and trouble. If you will have the cloth woven, the woof and the warp must be cast cross one to another. If you will have truths argued out, you must be content to bear with some opposition for the time. They who are not willing to bear some trouble, to be at some cost to find out truth, are unworthy of it. . . . We may well behold men's weakness in these divisions, but [we may] better admire God's strength and wisdom in ordering them to his glory and his children's good.²³

John Goodwin, making use of a text which the Independents repeatedly cited, declared: "The Holy Ghost, speaking (doubtless) of these times, prophesied long ago that *many should run to and fro, and (by this means) knowledge shall be increased.*" Goodwin went on to point out that "in times of Popery men generally stood still, made no inquiries beyond the lips of their teachers, and knowledge then was at a stand and advanced not." On the other hand, it seemed equally obvious that "since God hath been pleased to put it into the hearts of men to conceive . . . that there may be tracts or regions of knowledge beyond the line of the . . . discoveries of their teachers, and have made many studious expeditions themselves to find them out, knowledge hath increased; yea, and will increase daily more and more, if we relapse not into the lethargie of Popish slothfulness and servility, and suffer our teachers to exercise dominion over our faith."²⁴

This, quite obviously, is no doctrine of relativity so far as truth itself is concerned; the relativity is in terms of one's apprehension of truth. "Truth is a daughter of time was the saying of old," wrote Thomas Hooker, "and our daily experience gives in evidence and proof hereof. . . . Not that there is any change in truth, but the alteration grows according to men's apprehensions, to whom it is more or less discovered according to God's most just judgment and their own deservings."²⁵ Praisegod Barebones phrased it in this fashion: "About the measuring of which things [“the Temple, the Altar, and them that worship therein”], though the truth and true measure be one, yet the persons measuring are very various and much differing, not only concerning the right understanding of the measure, but also concerning the things measured. Hence it is that [there are] diversity of opinions and practices amongst persons concerning matters of religion and godliness."²⁶

It was because of this uncertainty regarding men's apprehension of truth that John Cook insisted that assent must not be required

even to such propositions "as the greatest number of wise and learned men shall agree upon." The reason why such assent must not be required, he continued, is easily given. It is "because, in very many councils, Jesus Christ hath been out-voted by anti-Christ."

Let the rigid Presbyterians in the Assembly but answer me this question: Whether two parts at least in three of all the ministers in this kingdom be not for a moderated episcopacy and the Common Prayer Book? If ever it come to a National Assembly, differences must be ended by a major vote.²⁷

In similar vein, John Goodwin asked: "Can that in reason be thought to be the Way of God which seemeth so only in the eyes of a few inconsiderable and for the most part illiterate persons? . . . Do not wise men see more than those that are weak, and many more than a few?" The answer to such questions as these, said Goodwin, was given long ago by Solomon when he pointed out that the race is not always won by the swift nor the battle by the strong, for "time and chance" frequently determine the outcome. By which Solomon meant that "God still reserves a liberty to himself to interpose and to carry the issues and events against all advantages . . . , when and where and as oft as he pleaseth."

Though God be at liberty to make the first discovery or communication of the light of his truth unto the world by greater numbers of men and those learned and in high esteem for wisdom . . . , as well as by one or fewer . . . , yet by the more frequent experience of all ages it appeareth that he taketh pleasure in this latter way rather than in the former.²⁸

It is for this reason, Goodwin asserted, that any "reformation according to the Word of God must give leave to the wind to blow where it listeth and give liberty to the Spirit of God to do with his own what he pleaseth; to make what discovery of truth he pleaseth and to what persons and when and where he pleaseth; and must not confine him to his market or compel him to traffic only with councils and synods for his heavenly commodities."²⁹

In the light of this fundamental contention, it would seem clear that the Independents did not plead for the right of people to differ and disagree and establish separate forms of worship simply because they themselves were a minority in the Assembly. Indeed, the only point at which they registered a fundamental dissent from the majority was precisely at the point of their unwillingness to agree to the establishment of any over-all instrument of coercion which could be utilized to secure conformity to opinions and practices which were in essential harmony with their own. They insisted that "no coactive violence" be "used against such men who carry themselves religiously and peaceably in their differences from others," because they remembered that "not

long since we were ourselves of another mind." "My sin" of conforming in an earlier time, said Burroughes,

makes me to be of the more forbearing spirit towards those who now differ from me. I see now what I did not; . . . Why, then, should . . . I fly upon our brethren because they see not what we think we see? O how unbecoming it is for . . . [men] to be harsh and bitter in the least degree against their brethren who differ from them, when they do differ so much from what they were themselves but a while since.³⁰

"I profess," said Burroughes, ". . . that were my judgment presbyterial, yet I should preach and plead as much for the forbearance of brethren differing from me, not only in their judgment but in their practice."³¹ The only alternative to such forbearance would be to require that men "put out their own eyes" and see only "by the spectacles of other men in point of God's service and worship."³²

John Saltmarsh, who in a sense stood outside both camps, summarized "the whole difference" in point of view in these words.

They of the presbytery would say to the state: We humbly petition you that heretics and schismatics (we believing all that differ from us to be so) may have your power inflicted upon them, whether to fines, imprisonment, or banishment. The Independents, on the contrary, would say: We humbly petition that you will not hazard nor endanger your civil power of the state to help our opinions against our brethren, for we are not *infallible* nor *apostolical*; *we see but in part*; and that you will not punish any of our brethren presbyterial or others for what they believe or differ from us in things of outward order in the gospel.³³

III.

While the Dissenting Brethren were ready to defend diversity, it must not be supposed that these men who had been so reluctant to separate themselves from communion with their parish churches viewed the divisions among Christians with equanimity. They were, in fact, dismayed and distressed by the divisions and by the bitterness of the controversy which these divisions had aroused. As for themselves, they said that they had made little or no attempt, after their return from exile, "to make and increase a party." Books were written against them by men of "much worth, learning, and authority," but, said they,

we knew and considered that it was the second blow that makes the quarrel, and that the beginning of strife would have been as the breaking in of the waters, and the sad and conscientious apprehension of the danger of rending and dividing the godly Protestant party in this kingdom that were desirous of reformation and [the danger] of making several interests among them in a time when there was an absolute necessity of their nearest union and conjunction . . . [have] prevailed with us to occasion the least disturbance among the people.³⁴

This account of their irenic behaviour is somewhat idealized, but it is true that a major portion of their attention was directed to the problem of healing the breaches and making real the unity they all had in Christ.

Perhaps the most complete statement of the Independent position as it related to the problem of sectarian conflict is to be found in a treatise by Jeremiah Burroughes with the rather formidable seventeenth century title, *Irenicum, to the Lovers of Truth and Peace Heart-Divisions Opened in the Causes of Evils of Them, with Cautions that We May Not Be Hurt by Them, and Endeavors to Heal Them*. Describing "heart-divisions" as the great "evil of our times," Burroughes proceeds to detail both the ill effects and the sinfulness of divisions among Christians. They destroy our peace and quiet, they hinder our sleep, they spoil our judgment, they absorb our time, they hinder our prayers, they hinder the use of our graces, they divert attention from more important matters. They are against the command of Christ, they are against the prayer of Christ, they are dishonorable to Christ, they grieve the Holy Spirit, they stir up corruption, they harden men in sin, they tend to void God's covenant of grace. In brief, he concludes, "our divisions are against the very character of Christianity." "We are wrangling, devising, plotting, working against one another, minding nothing but to get the day of one another," whereas "love and unity are Christ's badge, the arms of a Christian, whereby he shows of what house he is."³⁵

It is an unhappy fact, says Burroughes, that

we are divided notwithstanding we are all convinced of the evil of our divisions. We cry out exceedingly against them. We tell one another that of all the tokens of God's displeasure amongst us, these are the greatest. Yet scarce a man does anything . . . towards any help against divisions or furtherance of our union. Every man cries out at the thief, but who stops him? We all say we would have peace . . . , but where is the man who is willing to be at any cost for it.³⁶

It would be easy enough, of course, to secure unity "if those who differ from others would give up their judgments and practices to them, to believe what they believe, and to do what they do." But how is this to be achieved? "Christ hath laid this charge upon [his followers] . . . that they must not believe or practice anything in matters of religion but what they shall first see ground for out of his Word." A Christian is "not to alter his judgment or practice till, in the use of [all the means he can], he should receive further light from Him." Consequently, says Burroughes, "you would not have them give up their judgments or practices . . . till they know they are right; and how can that be till they, by discussing, praying, reading, meditating, find that out? If some men had certainly found out the right, and other men knew certainly that they had done so, then the work were at an end."³⁷

The problem was to find a way to unity when Christians do not all agree. "If we stay for peace and love till we come to the unity

of the faith in all things, we must stay, for ought I know, till we come to another world. . . . The unity of the faith and the perfect man will both be together."³⁸ The plain fact which must be faced, Thomas Goodwin reminded the members of Parliament, is that "providence hath disposed it so that they [the Saints] do and will differ in judgment. The Apostles, who were oracles infallible, could not in their times wholly prevent it. And differing thus in judgment, they will hardly ever of themselves agree." And yet, the great need of the kingdom is that animosities shall be allayed and that Christians shall be united and reconciled to one another. "It is your work and will be your honor," he informed the Commons, ". . . to find out ways whereby this may be done, notwithstanding these their differences."³⁹

IV.

If Christians are to be united, "notwithstanding their differences," there are several fundamental truths which these seventeenth century divines insisted must be recognized and accepted.

First of all, it is necessary to recognize that diversity will continue and that "love and peace" among Christians, therefore, cannot be procured without "liberty of conscience."⁴⁰

"When we complain of our divisions for making much against the cause of Christ," said Burroughes, "we do not complain against men because they cannot all understand all things alike." What we do complain of is "that they have not joined to study what ways and means may be found out to ease the consciences one of another, to bear with one another as far as Christ would have them." It is certain that Christ would not "be pleased with such a reformation wherein the lesser part should give up their consciences and practices to the judgments of the greater,"⁴¹ and it is equally certain that such a procedure would not succeed in bringing about unity.

It is a wonder of first magnitude how men come to have so much ground of hope . . . of composing differences and distractions . . . throughout the nation by exalting one way of discipline, of church government, for the treading down and trampling under foot of all others. . . . Undoubtedly that Way whose hand shall be against every [other] Way, will find the hand of every [other] Way will be against it, and then what manner of peace can reasonably be expected?⁴²

"A peaceable, humble, and quiet discussing of things" will contribute to understanding and thus lead toward agreement, but the resort to coercion when differences exist will only serve to arouse antagonism and aggravate differences.⁴³

It is necessary to recognize, in the second place, the unity that does exist among Christians.

There hath been much ado to get us to agree. We labored to get our opinions into one, but they will not come together. It may be [that] in

our endeavors for agreement we have begun at the wrong end. Let us try what we can do at the other end. It may be that we shall have better success there. Let us labor to join our hearts, to engage our affections, one to another. If we cannot be of one mind that we may agree, let us agree to be of one heart.⁴⁴

We must not forget that, while "godly people are divided in their opinions and ways, . . . they are united in Christ."

Though our differences are sad enough, yet they come not up to this to make us men of different religions. We agree in the same end, though not in the same means. They are but different ways of opposing the common enemy. The agreeing in the same means, in the same way of opposing the common enemy, would be very comfortable. It would be our strength. But that cannot be expected in this world.⁴⁵

The actual fact is that "our divisions have been and still are between good men," and it is equally true that "there are as many godly Presbyterians as Independents."⁴⁶ This means that, "though we are fully persuaded by God's Word and Spirit that this our Way is Christ's Way, yet we neither do nor dare judge others to be reprobates that walk not with us in it, but leave all judgment to God, and heartily pray for them."⁴⁷

It should be recognized, in the third place, that the mere fact of separation does not of itself constitute schism. "Though they may be divided from such a particular society, yet they are not divided from the Church," for "the true nature of schism is . . . an uncharitable, unjust, rash, violent breaking from union with the church or members of it."⁴⁸

To those who cried out against every separation, even when "loving and peaceable," as constituting schism, Burroughes made a lengthy and detailed reply.

Suppose the Nonconformists or those of the Scottish nation who lived in the City in former times, who could not acknowledge the bishops' authority nor communicate in the sacraments in the parishes where they lived without sin to them, still acknowledging them to be true churches, yet if Parliament made an Act whereby they should have two or three places in the City appointed for them, wherein all that could not conform . . . should have . . . the sacraments and other church ordinances . . . by themselves, freed from the burden of ceremonies and episcopal authority, would they not have blessed God for this liberty?⁴⁹

Would they have been guilty of schism to take advantage of this liberty? It is certain that "the allowance of the state" does not "alter the case." For, "if it be schism . . . without the allowance of the state, . . . it is schism when the state does allow it." In many instances, the state has granted such liberty. How are we to regard those who availed themselves of it?

Where the Lutherans and Calvinists have liberty to live in one country together, and yet not communicating with one another, are all the Lutherans or all the Calvinists schismatics? . . . Many of the French and

Dutch churches who live in our parishes, though they understand our language well enough, yet would not communicate in the parishes where they live because of the ceremonies and subjection to bishops, were they all schismatics too?⁵⁰

Furthermore, it is perfectly lawful for a man, for "the enjoyment of the ordinances that he cannot have in the church he formerly liveth in," to move from that parish to another where he can enjoy those ordinances. In this instance, no cry of schism is raised. But, "what if his dwelling be not removed to the other side of the street, does that make it schism?" Yet there are those who will brand as a schismatic any man who "lives in a parish and does not join in church fellowship in that parish."⁵¹ To defend the one practice and to condemn the other, Burroughes insisted, was not only illogical but unjust and unfair. It permits those who can afford it the liberty of choosing their church by choosing their dwelling, but it denies liberty to those who are in more restricted circumstances.⁵² John Goodwin makes the point even more vividly:

This liberty of choosing pastors only by choosing houses is so conditioned that it smiles only upon the rich (and that but somewhat faintly) but frowns upon the poor, and so is partial and therefore not Christian. He that hath enough of . . . all things may probably be able to accommodate himself within the precincts of what parish he pleaseth . . . by buying out some inhabitant or by purchasing ground and building upon it . . . , but the case of the poor man is many times such that he cannot tell where to find another hole in all the world to hide his head in besides that wherein it is hid already.⁵³

It was difficult for the Independents to believe that these arguments which laid so much stress on the place of birth and place of residence were to be taken seriously. Much more defensible, it seemed to them, was the position which Burroughes outlined in a sentence which was distinguished by its careful qualifications. "When men, who give good testimony of their godliness and peaceableness, . . . cannot without sin to them (though it be through weakness) enjoy all the ordinances of Christ and partake in all the duties of worship as members of that congregation where their dwelling is, they therefore in all humility and meekness . . . join in another congregation, yet . . . not condemning those churches they join not with as false but still preserve all Christian communion with the Saints as members of the same body of Christ, of the Church Catholic, and join also with them in all duties of worship that belong to particular churches so far as they are able—if this be called schism, it is more than yet I have learned."⁵⁴

Thus the Dissenting Brethren were pleading not only for "the peaceable practices of our consciences which the Reformed churches abroad allowed us," but for that which to them was much more important; namely, the establishment of the type of relationship among the churches in England which had existed between the Independents

and the Reformed churches abroad, among whom they had been cast to live, where "we both mutually gave and received the right hand of fellowship," recognizing, as Henry Burton put it, that "the Catholic Church . . . includes all true churches throughout the world."⁵⁵

Christians can live together in love and peace, "notwithstanding their differences," if they will grant liberty of conscience to those who disagree with them, if they will keep ever in mind the very real unity they have in Christ, and if they will cease to regard all other churches as false and schismatic. But beyond this, it should also be recognized that those of the various Ways can cooperate for common ends. All who "profess godliness" both can and must join together "in opposing that which they [all] believe cannot stand with godliness" and in promoting "those ways of godliness which they are convinced to be so." If this is done lack of agreement at other points need not be disastrous. After all, is it not true that "soldiers who march against a common enemy all under the same captain, who follow the same colors in their ensign and wear them upon their hats or arms, may get the day though they be not all clothed alike, though they differ in things of less concernment?" What must be done, then, is to "join with all our might in all we know, and with peaceable, quiet, humble spirits seek to know more and in the meantime carry ourselves humbly and peaceably toward those we differ from, and Christ will not charge us at the Great Day for retarding his cause."⁵⁶

V.

The Restoration of the Stuarts marked the collapse of the attempt by the Independent divines to secure peace and unity among Christians by a frank recognition that no particular ecclesiastical structure could be identified in any exclusive sense with the whole Church of Christ. Nevertheless, the defeat was only temporary. The fundamental convictions of the Independents concerning the nature of the church penetrated the thinking even of members of the episcopate; and as a result of the Act of Toleration of 1689, the establishment was given the formal status only of the greatest of the denominations. So thoroughly was the victory won that the leaders of the Evangelical Revival in England and America could take the denominational conception of the church largely for granted. By the twentieth century, with the exception of the Eastern Orthodox churches and some Anglo-Catholics, no serious dissent would be registered by members of the World Council of Churches to the observation by a Roman Catholic that, "when they speak of 'the Church,' documents emanating from the World Council . . . see this Church alike in each and every one of the various Christian denominations of which the Church is, as it were, the soul and, we might say, the sum total."⁵⁷

1. John Wesley, *The Character of a Methodist*; reprinted in *The Works of the Reverend John Wesley*, 4th ed. (London, 1841), VIII, 332-33.
2. While the word "denomination" does not appear to have taken on a technical meaning to denote a religious body much before the 1740's, it was used occasionally as early as the 1640's by John Goodwin. See John Goodwin, *Theomachia* (London, 1644), p. 23, and *Hagiomastix* (London, 1646), preface, and p. 40. The earlier equivalent of the word "denomination," which was used by the seventeenth century divines, was the word "way." They would speak of those of the Episcopal Way, the Presbyterian Way, and the Congregational Way.
3. John Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. John Allen (Philadelphia, n. d.), I, 34.
4. William Bradshaw, *The Unreasonableness of the Separation* (n. p., 1640), pp. 12-13.
5. *An Apologetical Narration* (London, 1643), p. 9.
6. *Conformity's Deformity* (London, 1646), p. 9.
7. Thomas Goodwin and Philip Nye in preface to John Cotton, *The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven* (London, 1644).
8. *An Apologetical Narration*, pp. 3-4. The elders of the churches in New England made much the same point with regard to their situation in the New World. "In these remote coasts of the earth whereunto the good hand of God hath brought us . . . we have seen cause to look back to our former administrations . . . and to search and try our ways that wherein soever we have formerly gone astray, we might judge ourselves for it before the Lord. And that seeing now God hath set before us an open door of Liberty, we might neither abuse our liberty in the gospel to run out into any groundless unwarrantable courses nor neglect the present opportunity to administer (by the help of Christ) all the holy ordinances of God according to the pattern set before us in Scripture. In our native country . . . many of us . . . bare [some things] as burdens, that is, as things inexpedient though not utterly unlawful, [that] we have no cause to retain and practice . . . here, [where they] would have been not only inexpedient but unlawful. Such things as a man may tolerate when he cannot remove them, he cannot tolerate without sin when he may remove them." *A Letter of Many Ministers in Old England Requesting the Judgment of their Reverend Brethren in New England, together with their Answer thereunto* (London, 1643).
9. *An Apologetical Narration*, pp. 9-10.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 10-11.
11. *Op. cit.*
12. *The Saints' Apology* (London, 1644), p. 14.
13. *A Survey of the Sum of Church Discipline* (London, 1648), preface. John Cook was to describe an Independent as "ever privy to his own infirmities, being far from dreaming of perfection in this life . . . He thinks himself the greatest sinner, being most privy to the deceitfulness of his own heart and is sure he hath more errors than he can discern." *What the Independents Would Have* (London, 1647), p. 4. The author of *A Moderate Answer to Mr. Prynne's Full Reply* (London, 1645), p. 38, affirmed: "As for our parts, we are far from such a thought that we know all things in the Word about church government but that more of it may still be revealed, and we daily search and wait for more knowledge in it."
14. "This we both have done and yet further are able to do, to prove our way with all our practices in every particular out of God's Word, which you are not able to do for any one of your practices, much less for the whole way of your classical presbytery." *Conformity's Deformity*, p. 9.
15. The Assembly complained of the Dissenting Brethren that they never endeavored "to prove that way of church government which they practice to be the only way *jure divino*." *The Answer of the Assembly of Divines* (London, 1645), p. 4. Thomas Edwards also had complained that in the view of the Independents "the government and way of the church visible is so uncertain and doubtful as that little or none may be positively laid down and concluded as *jure divino*." *Antapologia* (London, 1644), p. 85. The Dissenting Brethren freely acknowledged that this was true, saying that "the greatest difference . . . betwixt us being this, that the forms of government you pretend to (and we deny) are asserted to be *jure divino*." *A Copy of a Remonstrance* (London, 1645), p. 5.
16. *The Independency on Scriptures of the Independency of Churches* (London, 1643), preface. The Independents pointed out again and again that this was the major point at issue.
17. John Cook, *What the Independents Would Have*, p. 2.
18. *The Answer of the Assembly of Divines*, p. 17.
19. *A Confession and Protestation of the Faith of Certain Christians* (n.p., 1616).
20. *Irenicum* (London, 1646), p. 97.
21. *Ibid.*, pp. 237-40.
22. *The Unreasonableness of the Separation*, pp. 9-10.

23. *Ibid.*, pp. 242-45. Some years before, Praisegod Barebones had made the same point. "Unity or oneness of mind among the godly is an excellent thing and greatly to be desired, so it be in the truth; but God, that of his infinite wisdom causeth good to come out of evil, causeth much profit to attend the variations of his servants. The truth is the more sought into and discovered and cometh to shine forth more fully afterward. . . . It were much to be desired that persons would not be so much offended about the differences and variation there are in matters of religion and the service of God, if they would consider that great darkness had for a long time attended the world . . . , so as men coming out into the light see men like trees, as the proverb is. And again would mind how great oneness and agreement there is in those that differ, agreeing in the main points. . . . And then, on the other side, would consider how that the differences among the godly are of inferior kind, being only for the most part about outward worship and the right way of serving God, wherein if any do err . . . , his error cannot reach another in way of prejudice or hurt. . . . I say, if persons did but mind such like things, it would greatly abate of the prejudice that many have in their minds touching this matter . . . , for, indeed, it must needs be a great weakness of mind and want of judgment to be so highly displeased as some are with variety of judgments among men in matters of religion. . . . It is most certain that it is better there should be differences among men than that crass ignorance should take its place." *A Discourse tending to Prove . . . that the Baptism of Infants or Children is Warrantable and Agreeable to the Word of God* (London, 1642), preface.
24. *Hagiomastix*, preface. Thomas Hooker in the preface to *A Survey of the Sum of Church Discipline* and Jeremiah Burroughes in his *Irenicum* (pp. 244-45) both make a similar application of Daniel 12:4.
25. *Op. cit.*, preface.
26. *Op. cit.*, preface.
27. *Redintegratio Amoris* (London, n. d.), pp. 40-41. Not even the members of the Westminster Assembly, godly as they are and seeking the guidance of God's Spirit as they do, make any claim that "they are privileged with the privilege of infallibility." *Ibid.*
28. *Theomachia*, pp. 43-44.
29. John Goodwin, *Twelve Considerable Serious Cautions Very Necessary to Be Observed in . . . a Reformation according to the Word of God* (London, 1646), p. 8.
30. *Irenicum*, p. 97. *A Vindication of Mr. Burroughes* (London, 1646), pp. 17, 30.
31. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
32. John Cook, *Redintegratio Amoris*, p. 60.
33. John Saltmarsh, *Groans for Liberty* (London, 1646), p. 24.
34. *An Apologetical Narration*, pp. 24-27.
35. *Irenicum*, pp. 209, 242.
36. *Ibid.*, p. 215.
37. *Ibid.*, pp. 92, 207. A sixteenth century Anglican divine had said: "It is not enough for you to say that you believe as the church of your heart what thing it is that the church believeth. Your faith must not be grounded upon any other man's faith." "Believe not the doctrine because I or any other preacher doth preach it unto you; but believe it to be true because your own faith doth assure you it to be true." W. S. Hudson, *John Ponet: Advocate of Limited Monarchy* (Chicago, 1942), p. 41. This conventional Protestant conviction was a point the Independents repeatedly emphasized. John Goodwin, for example, insisted: "Ministers ought not to require their people to believe anything (much less everything) which they teach, unless they have a reason and ground for it. . . . Neither ought men to receive or subscribe unto with the hand of their faith the determination or decretals of synods, councils, or assemblies of persons of what capacity or worth soever in matters of religion, unless they have a sufficient reason or ground from the Word of God for what they do receive in this kind. . . . [Therefore], men ought to make use of, yea, and engage to the uttermost, their reasons or their discursive abilities in all matters of faith and religion whatsoever, and not to swallow anything by a loose credulity but to look narrowly upon everything with the eye of reason before they receive it by the hand of faith." *Hagiomastix*, p. 108.
38. *Irenicum*, p. 256.
39. Thomas Goodwin, *The Great Interest of States and Kingdoms* (London, 1646), pp. 53, 56.
40. John Cook, *What the Independents Would Have*, p. 14.
41. *Irenicum*, p. 107.
42. John Goodwin, *Theomachia*, p. 30.
43. *Irenicum*, p. 107. "That Way which shall be able to out-reason, not that which shall out-club, all other Ways will at last exalt unity and be itself exalted by gathering in all other Ways unto it." *Theomachia*, p. 30.
44. *Irenicum*, p. 255.
45. *Ibid.*, pp. 101, 102.
46. *Ibid.*, preface: *A Vindication of Mr. Burroughes*, p. 2. This is a consistent note throughout the Independent literature. Thus the New England ministers had written: "We separate from

the corruptions which we conceive to be left in your churches . . . , [but] as for yourselves, we are as far from separating as from no visible Christians as that you are, under God, in our hearts . . . to live and die together. And we look at sundry of you as men of that eminent growth in Christianity that if there be any visible Christians under heaven, amongst you are the men." *A Letter of Many Ministers in Old England Requesting the Judgment of their Reverend Brethren in New England.*

47. Henry Burton, *A Vindication of those Churches Commonly Called Independent*, p. 56. The Congregational Way, John Goodwin affirmed, "seeketh not . . . the molestation, harm, or disturbance of any . . . that are contrary-minded to it. It thinketh no evil, it speaketh no evil of such. If it conceives them upright and faithful with God and Jesus Christ, it embraceth them with all love, tenderness, and honor as partakers of like precious faith with itself, and nothing doubts but that they serve and worship God with as much sincerity and singleness of heart, and are accordingly accepted by him in their Way as itself." *Theomachia*, p. 27.
48. *Irenicum*, pp. 102, 171. "All believers who live in a place together ought, so far as they can, to join into one church, though they be of differing judgments and tempers." Thus, "where men may communicate without sin," they "must not separate from a church, though there be corruption in it, to gather into a new church which may be more pure and in some respects more comfortable. . . . There would be no continuance in church fellowship if this were admitted, for what church is so pure . . . , but within a while another church will be more pure? . . . You are bound to give so much respect to the church as to continue with much long-suffering to seek the good of that church, to remove the sin that is upon it with all the means you can. You must bear much with a brother; much more with a church." On the other hand, "where a man cannot have his soul edified in some ordinances and truths of great moment, which that church whereof he now is shall deny and is in great danger of being seduced to evil, he may depart from the church to another, if he does it orderly, and not be guilty at all of schism. Love to God and his own soul is the cause of this; not want of love to his brethren." To hold otherwise would be to maintain that "the Christians gathering themselves out of the Jewish church were schismatics," as would also be true of many during the time of the Reformation. *Ibid.*, pp. 162-63, 173-76.
49. *A Vindication of Mr. Burroughes*, p. 14.
50. *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15.
51. *Ibid.*, p. 15. This same point was made by the author of *The Saints' Apology*, "a year or two before this Parliament began." "Suppose a congregation in this land, some town or parish (to speak common road language) wherein a company of godly men (Saints all, so far as man can judge) had united themselves together by mutual covenant to walk in all the ordinances and ways of the Lord. . . . If, finding this society and their course fully to answer the persuasion of my heart concerning the way of God, I should change my habitation and take a house in that town that I might thereby join myself to this company in church fellowship . . . , there would be no complaining, no cry of separation, no whispering and muttering of forsaking mother church. . . . And yet, I should come out thereby from holding external communion with another. . . . And should I or others do any more but the same thing if in one street of a town we should join ourselves together in communion for spiritual ends and separate ourselves from the external communion which is held in another . . . , and all this without breaking off from internal communion with any Saint amongst them. . . . Whereunto, then, serveth the raising of so much noise and clamor of separation but to give up friends into the hands of enemies." *The Saints' Apology*, pp. 13-14.
52. *Irenicum*, pp. 164-65.
53. *Theomachia*, pp. 25-26.
54. *A Vindication of Mr. Burroughes*, p. 15.
55. *An Apologetical Narration*, pp. 7, 25. Henry Burton, *A Vindication of those Churches Commonly Called Independent*, p. 31. John Goodwin wrote of the Independents: "It is a main principle and maxim in this Way to hold terms of love and Christian correspondence with all persons of what judgment soever in point of [church] government, if they be godly, as well as with her own children." *Theomachia*, p. 31.
56. *Irenicum*, pp. 101, 107-08.
57. Editorial in *Istina*, commenting on the theme of the Evanston Assembly of the World Council of Churches, quoted in *Ecumenical Fellowship Notes of the American Baptist Convention*, October, 1954, p. 2.

JONATHAN EDWARDS' CONCEPTION OF THE CHURCH*

THOMAS A. SCHAFER, *Duke University*

As the pioneer of the New England Awakening and its literary defender, Edwards has long been associated with revivalism and sectarianism in American Protestantism. Several writers have noted that his *Faithful Narrative* (1737) of the 1734 Northampton revival, with its many translations and reprints, not only stimulated the Great Awakening of 1740 and later revivals but helped set the pattern of conversion experience in its more "enthusiastic" features.¹ Attention has been called to his involvement in the "hell-fire" preaching of the revival, its emotional excesses, its distorted conception of childhood religion, and its pietistic individualism.²

When Edwards' role in the Northampton communion controversy is added to his share in the revivals, he begins to appear as the champion of ecclesiastical individualism also.³ A. V. G. Allen makes Edwards the theological father of the separation of church and state in America, who provided the Church, by his doctrine of conversion and his insistence on conversion for church membership, with the basis for a separate existence and independent life.⁴ To T. C. Hall, Edwards' main interest was not the victory of the universal Church in or over history, but "a scheme of redemption for the individual saint, with its fruits of individual righteousness."⁵ Anglo-Saxon dissenting revivalistic congregationalism, not continental Calvinism, was his type.⁶ V. L. Parrington comes to much the same conclusion: though Edwards did not realize that he was helping destroy the theocracy, the parish system, and "the Presbyterian tendencies of the old order," his teachings led to the separatistic exaltation of the invisible Church and to local ecclesiastical autonomy.⁷

Edwards' writings and activities, according to this interpretation, became almost the fountainhead of the distinctive characteristics of modern American Protestantism, its conservative, revivalistic wing. Through its interest in evangelism and in the interdenominational fellowship of individual Christians, revivalism has fostered cooperative ventures some of which were important in the history of the Ecumenical Movement; but it has also contributed heavily to the sectarian conception of the Church in American Christianity. Much of the opposition to the World and National Councils now comes from this strand of Protestantism.

*Read at a session of the American Society of Church History at Lancaster, Pa., April 23, 1954.

It seems pertinent, then, to ask what Edwards himself thought about the Church, its nature, its unity, its form, and its destiny. A complete answer cannot be given here; that would require the whole of Edwards, including much unpublished material,⁸ to be reexamined from a fresh point of view. For example, Edwards' exact relation to the revival and his conception of the sacraments can only be touched on at a few important points, and no full comparison of his views with those of his predecessors can be essayed. This study has the modest aim of bringing some of Edwards' most characteristic ideas to focus on this subject, with the hope of correcting in some measure the general impression of his ecclesiology as a revivalist (in the later connotations of the term) and perhaps thereby of contributing to an understanding of our own American church-tradition.

Any effort to understand Edwards' doctrine of the Church as a part of his system of thought must begin with the question, "Why did God create the world?" In his essay on *The End for Which God Created the World*, Edwards answers that

a disposition in God, as an original property of his nature, to an emanation of his own infinite fulness, was what excited him to create the world; and so, that the emanation itself was aimed at by him as a last end of the creation.⁹

This communication of himself is an act of love or goodness. But since God's creative act terminates on himself as communicated, God may be said to have created the world for himself, for his own glory;¹⁰ for the glory of God in creation is "not . . . his essential glory but only his manifestative glory."¹¹ and because in the perception and reflection of the divine glory and communications of divine goodness consists the creature's happiness, it can be said that God created the world for the good of the creature.¹² By "creature," Edwards means "intelligent creature," for "intelligent beings are the consciousness of the world."¹³ Angels belong in this class, but Edwards usually makes the term synonymous with "mankind."

Can the proper objects of the divine outflow be more exactly designated? The elect indeed reflect God's love and mercy; but the reprobate reflect his justice and wrath—and Edwards says that *all* the divine attributes must be exercised.¹⁴ His answer is that love is prior to justice; for love moves to the conferring of being so that it may have an object, whereas justice only moves to the just treatment of an object already supposed to be in existence.¹⁵ Logically enough, Edwards turns out to be a supralapsarian on election and an infralapsarian on reprobation!

God's decree of the eternal damnation of the reprobate, is not to be conceived of as prior to the fall, yea, and to the very being of the persons, as the decree of the eternal glory of the elect is. For God's

glorifying his love, and communicating his goodness, stands in the place of a mere or ultimate end; and therefore is prior in the mind of the eternal disposer to the very being of the subject, and to every thing but mere possibility.¹⁶

The elect, then, are the prime objects of creation. However, they are chosen not in themselves primarily but in Christ, as united with him, as "Christ's elect spouse."¹⁷ In an early essay, Edwards shows an awareness that his concept of God's having in himself a necessity (albeit a necessity of superabundance) to outflow in self-communication seems to make creation eternally necessary. This conclusion is avoided, he answers, by the Trinity: "The Father's begetting of the Son is a complete communication of all his happiness, and so an eternal, adequate, and infinite exercise of perfect goodness that is completely equal to such an inclination in perfection."¹⁸ But Edwards immediately realizes that this would seem to remove the sufficient reason for creation, as he indicates in his very next words: "Why, then, did God incline further to communicate himself, seeing he had done it infinitely and completely?" The resolution of this dilemma is significant:

The Son has also an inclination to communicate himself in an image of his person that may partake of his happiness, and this was the end of creation. . . . Therefore the Church is said to be the completeness of Christ (Eph. 1:23), . . . as if Christ were not complete without the Church, as having a natural inclination thereto. We are incomplete without that which we have a natural inclination to.¹⁹

Thus redemption is exalted over creation, the divine outflow and return have as their poles Christ and the Church, and the whole "work of redemption" (which includes creation) becomes almost an extension of the Trinitarian process itself.

We may come at the Church in Edwards' thought from another angle. The essence of true religion, he says in the *Religious Affections*, "lies in holy love."²⁰ All that is saving and distinguishing in Christianity consists in love.²¹ True virtue "essentially consists in BENEVOLENCE TO BEING IN GENERAL. Or perhaps, to speak more accurately, it is that consent, propensity and union of heart to being in general, which is immediately exercised in a general good will."²² Only "intelligent being" can be the subject or object of this love, which flows out to particular beings proportionately to their own degree of being and the degree of their own consent to being in general (which is excellence).²³ God, as the highest being, whose being also infinitely consents to being in general, must receive the greatest degree of holy love.²⁴ Consequently, an intelligent being's ontological status is conditioned by his virtue, his consent to being in general.²⁵ By exercising this consent or love a spirit receives an increment both of being and of excellence, and by dissent from being in general he becomes a negative being: "Disagreement and contrariety to Being, is evidently

an approach to Nothing, or a degree of Nothing."²⁶ By the doctrine of the infinite evil of sin, the greater the being which dissents from being in general, the more heinous is his crime and the more nearly he becomes "as little or less, as bad or worse than nothing."²⁷

Hence it is that the manifestation of God's love and goodness "to the rational part of the world" really means "to good men, to those that answer the end of their creation."²⁸ The "mankind" whose ultimate happiness is the justification for both creation and redemption, are none other than the saints, the elect. The non-elect simply drop out of the picture or are assumed as one of the means whereby God advances the happiness of the saints; for they are only ontological ciphers.

II

Edwards' doctrine of the Church is metaphysically based in still another way. Edwards is emphatic that the elect are chosen as a part of Christ. By the "covenant of redemption" made eternally in heaven, the Son takes the elect as his portion and agrees to go on trial in his earthly ministry as their head. When "the man Christ Jesus" is justified by his obedience, the elect are acquitted through their "interest in Christ."²⁹ According to the covenant theology, Adam and Christ are federal heads and the sin of one and the righteousness of the other are imputed to those represented by them.³⁰ Now we know that Edwards went beyond the immediate imputation of Adam's sin and posited the identity of all mankind with Adam as consenting in the sinful disposition or inclination which preceded his actual sin.³¹ There is evidence that Edwards thought of some such real identity of the elect with Christ. By his doctrine of justification, saving faith results in the imputation of Christ's satisfaction and benefits to the soul precisely because it is an act of consent, of love, which joins the soul to Christ in a union so close that they must henceforth be treated as one: "What is *real* in the union between Christ and His people, is the foundation of what is *legal*."³² Grace is substantial, for it is the Holy Spirit himself, the Love of God. The Spirit regenerates the saints and becomes in them that true virtue which not only binds them to Christ but reflects and returns the divine emanations of goodness and glory.³³

This conception of faith, which can no longer be treated merely as the legal condition of covenant, leads Edwards to merge the covenant of grace (at least in so far as it is a covenant) in the covenant of redemption. The covenant of grace also is made with the saints not as separate individuals, but only as in Christ.³⁴ The Church, which is elect mankind and the body of Christ, is seen to be a universal, not

merely a collection of particulars; it is the new man which is in Christ and, in some sense, *is* Christ.

III

This unity of the Church's life is manifested in its fellowship on earth, its destiny in heaven, and its triumph in history. Edwards' doctrines of excellence and virtue provide a foundation for the fellowship of the saints, both here and hereafter. The harmony of bodies with one another is but a shadow of excellence; "the highest excellence therefore must be the consent of Spirits one to another. But the consent of spirits consists half in their mutual love one to another."³⁵ The other half is consent to God as the supreme Being, from which flows love to those who also love ("consent to") God.³⁶ This love of the brethren, observe, is motivated only in part by the divine agape ("benevolence"); it is also a love of complacency directed toward the excellence of the saints. It follows from this that if we really knew who are not of the elect, it would not be our duty to love them, but rather, to "dissent" from them.³⁷

The destiny of the saints is a perfect, yet increasing, mutuality and communion with one another in love.³⁸ Only in heaven do benevolence and complacency coalesce, for "there are none but lovely objects in heaven."³⁹ This dual character of their love, and the fact that each saint's capacity for happiness will be filled, prevents the degrees of glory, the seating arrangements of heaven from "damping" the happiness of the least of the elect.⁴⁰ This will be true also of the angels, over whom the Church shall be exalted.⁴¹ It is the saints' destiny also to be increasingly united and conformed to the glorified God-man, through whom they are to be admitted "into one society, one family, that his people should be in a sense admitted into the society of the Three Persons in the Godhead."⁴² For God aims at nothing less than an "infinitely strict" and perfect union of the Church with himself, one which becomes ever closer but is never finally achieved in fact.⁴³ The *visio Dei* which the saints in heaven have, even so, is not immediate and intuitive; it is mediated through the exalted Christ, who as Son can immediately behold the Father and as Man and Head of the body can communicate the vision to his members.⁴⁴ Again the unity of the Church in Christ appears.

A less immediate method by which the exalted saints may think God's thoughts and thereby augment their happiness is by witnessing the progress of the Church on earth. At the final consummation, when Christ shall marry his bride, the Church shall receive its proper reward and Christ the completion of his glory.⁴⁵ Until then, their happiness is "proleptical, or by way of anticipation."⁴⁶ Meanwhile, they sit as spectators of terrestrial affairs.⁴⁷

God's end in creation is realized inwardly in true virtue but outwardly in the "progress of the work of redemption." The Church, heavenly and earthly, is the kingdom of God. And though the remanation of the divine glory and the union of the elect in Christ have a static, timeless quality about them, the accomplishment of the end of creation in actual deed is a historical process taking place on earth and in terms of the visible Church. Following the general covenant scheme of church history,⁴⁸ Edwards organized his own *History of the Work of Redemption*⁴⁹ in the categories first of Biblical history and then of world history periodized and clocked by the cycles of the book of Revelation. The "advancement of the kingdom" was always dear to Edwards' heart; and he saw this advance, in his own day, in such political events as England's defeat of the powers of Antichrist (the Papacy) and even more in the progress of religious revival in Europe and America.⁵⁰ Edwards' millenarian expectations were linked with this idea of progress; he thought the Great Awakening in America was ushering in the millennial reign, which he expected to be a time of mass conversion of the heathen.⁵¹

The course of the Church in history, he believed, has been on the whole an upward one. In fact, the worst is past, Antichrist is soon to fall, and the sixth of the vials of tribulation has been poured.⁵² Much of the happiness of departed saints comes from contemplating the progress of the work of redemption as part of the manifestative glory of God. Indeed, they seem to be automatically advanced to a new stage of glory and happiness simultaneously with each great new era of the Church on earth.⁵³ This, says Edwards,

is one sense, wherein the saints of old, the Church in heaven, are not made perfect without the accomplishment of the glorious period of the Church's prosperity on earth: that the Church in heaven and the Church on earth are so united that the glory of the one is not advanced and perfected without the perfecting of the glory of the other; as is meet in those that are one body.⁵⁴

IV

Beyond doubt, the Church is one, both as the object of God's cosmic purpose and as the actual society of the triumphant redeemed. What of the continuity and outward unity of the visible Church? Edwards is no worshipper of ecclesiastical tradition, and he is wary of dependence on the authority of the early fathers;⁵⁵ nevertheless, he does not believe that the "perpetuity" of the Church has ever been lost.⁵⁶ The Church's continuity and authority reside in the Church's membership,⁵⁷ notwithstanding Edwards has a high view of the ministry and its delegated prerogatives.⁵⁸

Edwards' definition of a particular church as "a company of God's worship and service" is not inconsistent with historic congrega-

tional polity.⁵⁹ But there is constantly to be seen in his thought a tendency to embody the visible Church in higher and higher unities. He expresses a settled preference for presbyterian over congregational polity;⁶⁰ he leans toward "a convention of churches, that is, of the power of them," or a "higher synod" having the same disciplinary powers over the local congregation as the latter has over its individual members;⁶¹ and he approves regional and national churches as the natural divisions of Christendom.⁶² He is not, however, thinking of state churches under secular domination,⁶³ and he apparently does not see the great outpouring of the Spirit and the imminent triumph of the Church as a victorious justification of the theocracy; the theocracy has been spiritualized.⁶⁴

But Edwards believed in making visible the unity of the Church on an even more universal scale and in terms of worship. In 1747, his *Humble Attempt to Promote Explicit Agreement and Visible Union of God's People in Extraordinary Prayer for the Revival of Religion and the Advancement of Christ's Kingdom on Earth* gave powerful support to a proposal issued in Scotland for united prayer by all Christians at definite stated times. Edwards himself had suggested the idea in 1742 with the American colonies in mind, on the ground that "Christ delights greatly in the union of his people, as appears by his prayer in the 17th of John: and especially is the appearance of their union in worship lovely and attractive unto him."⁶⁵

In his "Humble Attempt," Edwards urges the "good tendency" of such prayer to achieve its object (by being, in a sense, the object itself) and the united, international character which the Church will possess in the millennium.⁶⁶ When we remember that "union," "consent," "excellence," and "love" are largely synonymous in Edwards' vocabulary, his argument from the "beauty" of such a united effort takes on new significance:

Union is one of the most *amiable* things that pertains to human society; yea, it is one of the most beautiful and happy things on earth, which indeed makes earth most like heaven. God has made of one blood all nations of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth; thereby teaching us . . . that it becomes mankind all to be united as one family. . . . A *civil* union . . . is amiable; but much more a pious union, and sweet agreement in the great business for which man was created, . . . the life and soul of which is LOVE. Union is spoken of in scripture as the peculiar beauty of the church of Christ. . . .

As it is the glory of the church of Christ that in all her members, however dispersed, she is thus *one*, one holy society, one family, one body; so it is highly desirable that this union should be *manifested*, and become visible.⁶⁷

Edwards is thus apologist for the first ecumenical effort in Protestantism at a "world day of prayer" for the Church's mission and unity. His influence is seen in similar 19th-century movements.⁶⁸

V

It is natural to ask, at this point, how wide is the swath that the Church and the "work of redemption" cut through the field of history. For the visible Church on earth has in it also the unregenerate and the reprobate. How is this Church related to the "kingdom of Christ"? Such examination as we can attempt here may well be introduced with an item in the "Miscellanies" from the earlier years of Edwards' Northampton ministry, which comes as near as anything he wrote to being a formal definition of the Church:

There is abundance of talk in the world about "the Church" and "the true Church"; but it is a very difficult thing to me to know what they mean by it. By the Church, in Scripture, is certainly meant nothing else but God's people or Christ's people, either really, or at least externally and in appearance. . . . I can therefore think of no other sensible meaning of the phrase "true Church" or "truly God's Church," than either those that are truly and really God's people and Christ's people, or those that truly have those outward appearances of being God's people, that they are so in the eye of a Christian judgment and, according to gospel rules, are to be looked upon, respected, and behaved towards as such. And, by a particular true church, must be meant a society of men that are visibly God's people, or so, really, in the eye of Christian judgment, and that are indeed joined together in the Christian holy public worship.⁶⁹

There are two aspects of the Church, not two utterly different entities. As its members are "truly and really God's people," the Church is invisible; as they "truly" have the appearance of being "really" God's people, the Church is visible. Only four numbers earlier in the "Miscellanies" (No. 335), Edwards had first turned his attention to the problem of "visible Xtians." Since it contains the doctrine around which the communion controversy raged, a part of the number may be worth quoting:

In order to men's being regularly outward members of the Christian Church, they should be visible Christians, or visibly Christians. Now by being visibly Christians nothing else can be understood but being in appearance Christians, appearing really Christians, true Christians. When we say "true Christians in appearance," it can't be understood that it is meant that he should appear so to a prejudiced, and weak, and unfair uncharitable judgment. . . . Nor . . . that he should appear so in the eye of every particular man. . . . Therefore to be a visible Christian is to appear to be a real Christian in the eye of a public Christian judgment and to have a right in Christian reason and according to Christian rules to be received and treated as such.

This initiated a whole series of private studies devoted to the visible Church and its outward constitution. "The gospel rule," he writes in the second of these, "seems to be to receive those that make a profession of a hearty [i.e., from the heart] believing the truth of the gospel, and a walking . . . according to the moral rules of the gospel. We are not directed to try them by an examination of their par-

ticular experiences. . . ." Nevertheless, "persons must either be treated as Christians, or as no Christians. They must either be let in or shut out; there is no medium."⁷⁰ His temporary solution of the problem under Stoddardeanism, whereby all the baptized who would "own the covenant" were admitted to the Lord's Supper,⁷¹ was indeed to encourage all to come, but at the same time to make clear that only those might properly come whose "owning" was internally known to be a profession of the essentials of Christian piety.⁷² Finally, in No. 873, he asserted clearly that these essentials are involved in the profession made when an adult owns the covenant and is admitted to the Lord's Supper.

Whether it was by the Timothy Roots or the entrepreneurs that he was hounded out of Northampton,⁷³ Edwards himself was fighting for a theological principle: the words of profession used in admitting to full membership in the Church must be publicly understood to be a profession of saving faith and complete commitment to Christ as Savior and Lord. Throughout the controversy, Edwards contended that he did not require that either the applicant or his pastor be assured beyond doubt that the person was of the elect.⁷⁴ He was willing to settle for a form of words as general as these: "I hope, I do truly find a heart to give up myself wholly to God, according to the tenor of that covenant of grace which was sealed in my baptism, and to walk in a way of that obedience to all the commandments of God, which the covenant of grace requires, as long as I live."⁷⁵ Such a confessant was to be received by minister and church as sincere "to the eye of Christian charity," no evidence to the contrary appearing.

It is no wonder Edwards could not formulate a confession acceptable to the opposition; for the basic conflict revolved around the signification of the words used in the most minimum of statements. Stoddard had argued that the Lord's Supper was a "converting ordinance" and that the only requirements for admission to it were doctrinal orthodoxy, an outwardly moral life, and a "sincerity" which was compatible with the candidate's own knowledge that he was as yet unregenerate; he had made the church covenant completely external and sundered it from the covenant of grace.⁷⁶ Oddly enough, one of Stoddard's main arguments had been that the Church's judgment of sainthood was so defective, and God's predestinating ways so inscrutable, and the number of the elect so small that far more reprobate than elect would be admitted to the Church even if the old requirement of a profession of saving faith were retained.⁷⁷

Edwards denied that Christ *instituted* the Supper as a converting ordinance, though he admitted it might have that effect. And while he too could preach the broadness of the way that leads to destruction, he really believed that when the Church is spiritually awake and its

ministers faithful in their task, their judgment will ordinarily be trustworthy. Indeed, he insists, there is no other course open to the Church. Unless we can trust this "Christian judgment," the Lord's Supper itself is no longer a love feast⁷⁸ and no foundation is left for Christian communion and for the exercise of virtuous love in the Church.⁷⁹

But the heart of Edwards' case against Stoddardeanism was that it divided church members into two categories, real saints and visible saints. One might profess visibility of sainthood without being understood to profess sainthood itself. Edwards cut through this sophistry mercilessly. Over and over he says, in as many different ways as he can: a visible saint is a visibly *real* saint. "There are not properly two distinct churches of Christ, one the real, and another the visible," though "the visible or seeming church is of larger extent than the real."⁸⁰ The whole trend of Edwards' argument is that so far as men are concerned there is one Church of God, not two; and such distinction as there indeed is between the visible and the invisible churches is not the primary concern of the Church itself. Exactly the same relation holds between the eternal church covenant, publicly made at Baptism and Confirmation, and the internal covenant of justification.⁸¹

Edwards granted that there were many in the Northampton ecclesiastical community who could not meet the test he proposed. This fact would not keep them from any of the ordinances that were truly converting by institution and tendency, but it would keep them from a false, damnifying security. It would also prevent the development of self-consciously converted *ecclesiolae* within the *ecclesia*; for if the Church as such cannot have the communion of saints, committed Christians will be tempted to seek out one another in order to relate their experiences and enjoy Christian fellowship.⁸² From this, separatism easily develops. And Edwards denounced separatism even as he renounced Stoddardeanism.⁸³

It has sometimes been said⁸⁴ that though Edwards opposed Stoddardeanism, he did not throw over the Half-Way Covenant. Edwards, however, did recognize it as an objection to his point of view that it would result in abandoning that scheme also.⁸⁵ This he admits, but points out that baptism of infants has its saving efficacy and justification in that the infants are baptized as members of their parents, to be brought up in the parents' faith. But if the latter have no faith, how can they bring up their children in it? And "what is the *name* good for, without the thing?"⁸⁶ The covenant blessings assured pious parents at their child's Baptism, such as security concerning his salvation if he dies in infancy, the promise of divine aid in his upbringing, and his very probable salvation as an adult,⁸⁷ cannot be automatically extended by Baptism after the sponsors' faith is gone.⁸⁸

VI

Beyond its social desirability (a considerable factor, no doubt, in Northampton's distaste for Edwards' "innovation"), membership in the visible Church has often mattered to men because there seemed to be some correlation between it and acceptance with God. That the bond between the external and internal covenant was close indeed in Edwards' thought is suggested by a brief but carefully worded paragraph stating that "they that are regularly and justly excommunicated are bound in heaven. The wrath of God abides upon them." Though it is to be hoped, he continues, that God will not allow a godly man through his obstinacy to bring such a just censure upon himself, He "will never give an excommunicate person repentance, except it be in that way of his using proper means to be restored." Edwards' conclusion is that "excommunication does as much mark out men as being in a damnable condition, as if it made them so."⁸⁰

Later, in a much longer essay,⁸⁰ Edwards reaffirms this view of excommunication in even more vigorous language; he also extends the discussion to the admission of members into the Church. In the visible covenant, by virtue of which he acts as Head of the Church, God descends from the level of his secret, decretive will, whereby he is the Searcher of hearts, to the plane of his revealed, preceptive will, whereby he takes men into the visible Church on presumption of their sincerity and perseverance. From the former viewpoint, the elect will have faith and will persevere; from the latter, those who truly believe and persevere will be saved. As Edwards explains it:

When persons therefore do regularly enter into the Christian Church, God receives them into his family as his children, and Christ receives them as his spouse, and they are as it were then redeemed. Christ gives them the price of his redemption, and they are as it were then justified and adopted, on presumption of their being sincere. . . . And if they fail of obtaining those promises that Christ has presumptively made over to them they must not lay it to Christ's unfaithfulness, but to . . . their own guile and deceit in covenanting and their own treachery towards him by proving otherwise than they pretended to him and as he, graciously trusting in them, received them.⁸¹

Here is the contract theory of the covenant with a vengeance! And here, obviously, is an answer to the question so often posed: how can Edwards, with his high doctrine of predestination, engage in revival preaching and appeal to the wills of men? An answer is also found in Edwards' conception of the means of grace in general. God has chosen, he says again and again, to bestow his justifying and sanctifying grace where there is some "matter" for it to work upon. In the ordinary course of things the syllogism runs: no use of means, no preparatory work in the soul; no preparatory work, no fuel for the

divine flame; no fuel, no fire. Edwards will not make this relation so absolutely causative that God cannot break in apart from means, but the following sentence pretty well states his own belief: "God does not see meet to infuse grace, where there is no opportunity for it to act, or to act in some measure suitably."⁹² Hence the role of the visible Church, with its worship, preaching, and sacraments. It is the means by which God ordinarily inducts men into his household and prepares them for glory; and, for all the practical purposes imposed by time and history, it is the divine society itself.

VII

Some tentative conclusions can be drawn. Edwards' conception of the Church is rooted in his ontology and cosmology. The Church of the elect is mankind as aimed at in the creation, is the completion of the Trinity's primal urge to love and communicate good. Edwards has a high doctrine of the transcendent oneness of the Church in Christ, a unity buttressed by his theological and philosophical realism.⁹³ Its unity of fellowship is given metaphysical ground in Edwards' doctrine of excellence, and a glorious fulfillment in his eschatology. His synchronization of the progress of the Church triumphant with that of the Church militant is a daring representation of the unity of the whole Church. His optimism with respect to the Church's fortunes in and at the end of history are refreshing, and the way in which he bases his ecumenical concerns in Biblical ecclesiology and eschatology is prophetic of our own day. His refusal to sunder the visible and invisible churches, his preference for a polity more representative of the larger Church, and the emphasis which he places upon the Church's "means of grace" all stand in contrast to the popular view of Edwards as the predestinarian *par excellence* or the "fiery" evangelist.

We must not, of course, discount his defects, such as his inadequate understanding of childhood religion, his Biblicism, and certain traces of sentimentalism. In these he was very much a child of his day. His understanding of the personal and individual character of faith, over-emphasized and distorted by many of his followers to the exclusion of social concern, did not, however, mean social irresponsibility for Edwards, as Perry Miller has shown.⁹⁴

But Edwards had no intention of destroying the covenant theology; he reaffirmed it with emphasis on both its legal and its real features, and in a churchly context. His position in the communion controversy was not separatism or sectarian exclusiveness; it was the 18th-century counterpart of "Let the Church be the Church." As Trinterud has said of the Tennants,⁹⁵ Edwards must be seen as a theologian who in intention (and to some extent in accomplishment) strengthened the classical Protestant conception of the Church.

1. M. Louise Greene (*The Development of Religious Liberty in Connecticut* [Boston, 1905], pp. 227-228) lists this work and the preaching of Whitefield as the powers of the 1740 Awakening. Ola Winslow is severe on the *Faithful Narrative* for its models of piety (Jonathan Edwards, 1703-1753 [New York, 1940], pp. 166-169). In Edwards' later criticisms of the revival, she says, "He spoke too late and too temperately. Besides, all New England remembered Phoebe Bartlett" (*ibid.*, p. 205). In his essay on Edwards (*Hours in a Library* [New York, 1894], I, 307-312), Leslie Stephen is bitter against him for defending his revival against the charge of enthusiasm and for afflicting poor little wretches like the "detestable infant" of the *Faithful Narrative* with threatenings of hell fire. Oliver Wendell Holmes opined that the people of Northampton ejected Edwards primarily for preaching terror to them and for calling their little children vipers (*Writings* [Boston, 1891], VIII, 391-393).
2. In a generally perceptive article ("Jonathan Edwards and the Revivalists," *Christian Examiner*, XLIII [1847], 374-394), W. H. Channing insists that the revivalist conception of conversion, especially as preached by Whitefield, strengthened the tendency to individualism and private religion already dominant in Protestantism. He admits, however, the existence of other elements in Edwards' thought which favored the larger unities of the Christian faith.
3. That separatist congregational churches resulted from the Great Awakening, along with the multiplication of Baptist and Quaker congregations, is well known. See, e.g., W. W. Sweet, *Religion in Colonial America* (New York, 1952), pp. 139, 290-292.
4. *Jonathan Edwards* (Boston, 1889), pp. 254-256.
5. *The Religious Background of American Culture* (Boston, 1930), pp. 148-151.
6. This Dissent, with its theology of the unmediated encounter between God and the individual conscience, "is more Protestant than either Lutheranism or Calvinism" (*ibid.*, p. 151).
7. *Main Currents in American Thought: I. The Colonial Mind* (New York, 1927), p. 162.
8. This is particularly true of the large number of sermons still in manuscript. Those who in the past selected the sermons to be published posthumously were not primarily interested in the doctrine of church and sacraments—in itself a significant fact. What is probably the next most important unpublished source has, however, yielded a substantial part of the material on which this study is based; that is, the MS. "Miscellanies," which are used and quoted with the kind permission of the Sterling Library at Yale University, where the originals are preserved.
9. *The Works of President Edwards*, ed. Sereno E. Dwight (New York, 1829-30), III, 21. The italics have been dropped from this quotation but are elsewhere retained. The essay will be cited as the "End in Creation," and all citations of *Works* refer to this ten-volume edition.
10. "This propensity to diffuse himself, may be considered as a propensity to himself diffused; or to his own glory existing in its emanation" (*ibid.*, p. 23).
11. MS. sermon on I John 3:2, in the Yale Collection.
12. This is argued at length in the "End in Creation," *Works*, III, 27ff. Edwards' early MS. sermons and notes are full of the theme.
13. "Miscellanies," No. 87.
14. This is the implication of the argument in the "End in Creation," *Works*, III, 18-21. The idea is more forcibly expressed in the MSS. ("Miscellanies," No. 1218, e.g.) but always stops short of pantheistic necessity.
15. "Miscellanies," No. 445.
16. "Miscellaneous Remarks," *Works*, VII, 435-436.
17. *An Unpublished Essay of Edwards on the Trinity*, ed. G. P. Fisher (New York, 1903), p. 133.
18. "Miscellanies," No. 104.
19. *Ibid.*
20. *Works*, V, 19.
21. *Charity and its Fruits*, ed. Tryon Edwards (New York, 1856), p. 23.
22. "The Nature of True Virtue," *Works*, III, 94.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 95-98.
24. *Ibid.*, pp. 97-98.
25. "The Mind," *Works*, I, 697-701.
26. *Ibid.*, p. 695.
27. "Miscellanies," No. 41. On the infinite evil of sin, see Edwards' great work on "Original Sin," *Works*, II, 329-330.
28. MS. sermon on Rev. 21:18, in the Yale Collection. Cf. "Miscellanies," No. 571, printed in *Works*, VIII, 549.
29. This covenant is described in the essay printed by E. C. Smyth as *Observations concerning the Scripture Oeconomy of the Trinity and Covenant of Redemption* (New York, 1880).
30. Edwards accepts this scheme ("Original Sin," *Works*, II, 542; "Miscellanies," No. 35).
31. "Original Sin," *Works*, II, 542-549. This was not a later idea of Edwards; it developed out of his idealism and is explicitly stated in "Miscellanies," No. 18, long before he shows any ac-

- quaintance with Stapfer, whose authority he cites in the *Original Sin*.
32. "Justification by Faith," *Works*, V, 364. For a fuller discussion, see my article on "Jonathan Edwards and Justification by Faith," *Church History*, XX (1951), 55-67.
 33. This is the burden of Edwards' "Treatise on Grace." See A. B. Grosart, ed., *Selections from the Unpublished Writings of Jonathan Edwards, of America* (Edinburgh, 1865), pp. 41ff.
 34. "Miscellanies," No. 2. "The new covenant itself witnesses that it is made with Christ, and not with believers considered as distinct from him" (*ibid.*, No. 163).
 35. "The Mind," *Works*, I, 697.
 36. Edwards' own attachment to those who evidenced Christian grace appears in many of his writings. Cf. his "Personal Narrative," *Works*, I, 66-67, 99, and his tribute to Sarah Pierrepont (*ibid.*, pp. 114-115).
 37. "... consent to Being is dissent from that, which dissents from Being" ("The Mind," *Works*, I, 700). Cf. "The End of the Wicked Contemplated by the Righteous," *Works*, VI, 474.
 38. "Christ loves all his saints in heaven. . . . And they all, with one heart and soul, unite in love to their common Redeemer All the members of the glorious society of heaven are sincerely united. . . . Not a heart is there that is not beloved by all the others. And as all are lovely, so all see each other's loveliness with full complacency and delight" (*Charity and Its Fruits*, p. 478).
 39. *Ibid.*, p. 470.
 40. *Ibid.*, pp. 480-481. Cf. "Miscellanies," Nos. 5 and 198, *Works*, VIII, 527-529, 532-533.
 41. See the numbers in *ibid.*, pp. 496-527. Edwards makes envy and a refusal to be ministering spirits to the saints prime causes for the fall of some of the angels.
 42. *Ibid.*, p. 549.
 43. "End in Creation," *Works*, III, 85-87.
 44. "Miscellanies," No. 777.
 45. *Ibid.*, No. 86.
 46. *Ibid.*, No. 565.
 47. *Works*, VIII, 543. Edwards, with his Lockean psychology, makes various attempts to work out a satisfactory theory of perception for "separate spirits" in order to make this possible. Cf. "The Mind," *Works*, I, 678-679; "Miscellanies," No. 264, *Works*, VIII, 534.
 48. The scheme is briefly indicated by William Ames (*Medulla Theologica* [Amstelodami, 1628], chapters 38-41); as elaborated by later writers (e.g., Peter van Maastricht (*Theoretico-Practica Theologia* [ed. nova; Trajecti ad Rhenum, 1699], Lib. VIII), the "dispensation of the covenant of grace" includes whole textbooks in Biblical history, church history, and eschatology.
 49. Edited posthumously by John Erskine, it was based on a 1739 series of sermons. So important did Edwards consider this theme that he planned to organize a whole body of divinity around it. See his letter to the Princeton trustees (*Works*, I, 568-571).
 50. "History of the Work of Redemption," *Works*, III, 367ff. Cf. "An Humble Attempt to Promote Explicit Agreement and Visible Union of God's People in Extraordinary Prayer for the Revival of Religion and the Advancement of Christ's Kingdom on Earth . . .," *ibid.*, pp. 486-91.
 51. "Thoughts on the Revival," *Works*, IV, 128-133.
 52. "An Humble Attempt . . .," *Works*, III, 517-540.
 53. "Miscellanies," No. 777 sets forth these ideas in a long article entitled "The Happiness of Heaven Is Progressive." Such eras were inaugurated by the reign of Solomon, the ascension of Christ, and the Reformation.
 54. *Ibid.*
 55. *Ibid.*, No. 72.
 56. *Ibid.*, No. 852.
 57. Edwards' defense of the revival is in a sense an expression of that belief, which in turn is based on his doctrine of spiritual light. Cf. "Thoughts on the Revival," *Works*, IV, 171-176; "A Treatise concerning Religious Affections," *Works*, V, 183-185; "A Divine and Supernatural Light," *Works*, VI, 186.
 58. See "Thoughts on the Revival," *Works*, IV, 241-246, and Edwards' letter of rebuke to a layman who had begun to preach (printed in Samuel Miller, *Life of Jonathan Edwards* [New York, 1856], pp. 71-73). In the Congregationalism of Edwards' day the office of lay elder was practically extinct. The pastor was "the elder of his church and was charged with the duties once exercised by the 'presbytery' of the church, among which was the proposal of candidates for admission and discipline" (Williston Walker, *A History of the Congregational Churches in the United States* [6th edition; New York, 1907], pp. 227-229). Edwards accepted and justified this situation (e.g., in "Miscellanies," Nos. mm, qq, 40, 65), even so far as to suggest that in the New Testament Church the function of government was not a "standing office" distinct from that of pastor (MS. note on I Cor. 12:28).
 59. "Miscellanies," No. 339. Cf. the Cambridge Platform, Chapter II (Williston Walker, *Creeds and Platforms of Congregationalism* [New York, 1893], pp. 204-205).

60. Letter of July 5, 1750, to John Erskine, *Works*, I, 412.
61. "Miscellanies," Nos. 90, 349. Here is to be seen, no doubt, the influence of the Saybrook Platform. In the Breck case, we find Edwards writing in defense of the disciplinary powers of consociations and associations (see *A Letter to the Author of the Pamphlet Called an Answer to the Hampshire Narrative* [Boston, 1737], pp. 20ff.
62. "Miscellanies," Nos. 69, 90.
63. He denies (*ibid.*, Nos. 9, 11) that civil authority gives any right to dictate in ecclesiastical affairs.
64. Cf. Allen, *Jonathan Edwards*, pp. 56, 254-257, and Herbert W. Schneider, *The Puritan Mind* (New York, 1930), pp. 106-107, 126. The magistrate's task seems to be limited to the general promotion of religion and the protection of congregations in such rights as assembly and public worship ("Thoughts on the Revival," *Works*, IV, 144-147, 266). Certain of these rights, though dealing with spiritual matters, become civil to the extent that they affect a people's "advantage in this world" ("Miscellanies," No. 14).
65. "Thoughts on the Revival," *Works*, IV, 272. See Edwards' letter of Sept. 23, 1747 to William McCulloch (*Works*, I, 242-243).
66. *Works*, IV, 460-468.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 492.
68. See Ruth Rouse and Stephen C. Neill, eds., *A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948* (London, 1954), p. 228.
69. "Miscellanies," No. 339.
70. *Ibid.*, No. 338. Edwards was willing privately to hear and evaluate such "particular experiences." His criteria are set forth in a private list of "Directions for Judging of Persons' Experiences" (Grosart, *Selections*, pp. 183-185).
71. There is still some disagreement as to the extent of this right in Stoddard's own practice. Cf. Williston Walker (*History of the Congregational Churches*, p. 181) with Perry Miller ("Solomon Stoddard, 1643-1729," *Harvard Theological Review*, XXXIV [1941], 298; *The New England Mind: From Colony to Province* [Cambridge, Mass., 1953], p. 227).
72. "Miscellanies," No. 462. This seems to have been the purpose of the Northampton church covenant of 1742 and its place in the development of Edwards' thought (*Works*, I, 165-168).
73. Cf. Ola Winslow, *Jonathan Edwards*, pp. 224-225, 251-252, with Perry Miller, *Jonathan Edwards* (New York, 1949), pp. 218-219.
74. "An Humble Inquiry into the Rules of the Word of God concerning the Qualifications Requisite to a Compleat Standing and Full Communion in the Visible Christian Church" (1749), *Works*, IV, 297 *et passim*. This work is hereafter cited as "Qualifications for Communion."
75. "Misrepresentations Corrected, and Truth Vindicated, in a Reply to the Rev. Mr. Solomon Williams's Book . . ." *Works*, IV, 465-466.
76. See Sereno Dwight's life of Edwards, *Works*, I, 300-305, and Perry Miller's article on Stoddard, *Harvard Theological Review*, XXXIV, 305-308.
77. "Qualifications for Communion," *Works*, IV, 302, 333-334, 366.
78. *Ibid.*, pp. 365-368. Edwards expressed disappointment in the revival for not increasing the frequency of this "feast-day with God's saints" and indicated weekly celebration as the norm ("Thoughts on the Revival," *Works*, IV, 273-274).
79. "Misrepresentations Corrected," *Works*, IV, 467-468 and n.
80. "Qualifications for Communion," *Works*, IV, 301. "To say a man is visibly a saint, but not visibly a real saint, but only visibly a visible saint, is a very absurd way of speaking . . . and to use words without signification" (*ibid.*).
81. *Ibid.*, pp. 320ff. Confirmation is admission to the Eucharist. "What is there pretended to be done in episcopal Confirmation, that Christ did not design the Lord's Supper for?"—"Miscellanies," No. 207.
82. *Ibid.*, p. 432.
83. *Ibid.*, pp. 285-286 (Preface).
84. For example, by H. M. Dexter, *The Congregationalism of the Last Three Hundred Years, as Seen in Its Literature* (New York, 1880), p. 487n.
85. "Qualifications for Communion," *Works*, IV, 423ff.
86. *Ibid.*, p. 425.
87. "Miscellanies," No. 577.
88. "Qualifications for Communion," *Works*, IV, 427; "Miscellanies," No. 595.
89. "Miscellanies," No. 485.
90. *Ibid.*, No. 689.
91. *Ibid.* "There is just so much difference between this covenanting and the invisible covenanting with a believing soul, and no more, as will naturally and necessarily arise from God's acting in the one case as the Searcher of hearts, and in the other not, supposing God in both cases to proceed on the same foundation and with the same drift" (*ibid.*).
92. *Ibid.*, No. 539.
93. It is significant that the imputationist Charles Hodge listed, as Edwards' sole departures from Old Calvinism, these two: "that he taught Stapfer's scheme of the mediate imputation of Adam's

sin" and "that he held an eccentric philosophical theory of the nature of virtue, as consisting wholly in love to being in general" ("Jonathan Edwards and the Successive Forms of New Divinity," *Biblical Repertory and Princeton Review*, XXX [1858], 589). Both of these, as we have shown, involve elements of realism which influ-

enced Edwards' doctrine of the unity of the Church.

94. See especially his article, "Jonathan Edwards' Sociology of the Great Awakening," *New England Quarterly*, XXI (1948), 50-77.
95. L. J. Trinterud, *The Forming of an American Tradition* (Philadelphia, 1949), p. 180.

DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS

"John Calvin, the Teacher. The Correlation Between Instruction and Nurture within Calvin's Concept of Communion." By George Aiken Taylor, (First Presbyterian Church, Alexandria, Louisiana) Duke University, 1953. Director: Ray C. Petry.

This is an investigation into a hitherto relatively unexplored area of Calvin's thought: the teaching ministry of the Church. It relates the instructional emphasis in Calvin's thought primarily to his religious epistemology. But it also finds that a preoccupation with instruction lay at the heart (and is essential to an understanding) of Calvin's views on the Word, the Church, the task of the Ministry, Christian nurture and effective civil government. This study finds a close connection between teaching and the redemptive task of the Church which casts new light upon the Church's function as a mother, upon Calvin's identification of religious experience with the knowledge of God and upon Calvin's understanding of the Word in its relation to preaching and the sacraments.

For Calvin, the chief means of Grace is the Word, which is the true, earthly reflection of the eternal and living Word, Christ. For man to receive Grace, he must be exposed to Grace, which means, frankly and literally, being exposed to the Word or to the content of the Word expressed in "doctrine." A person, hearing the Word, hears God speak; a person, receiving the Word, admits the divine light; and a person, learning the truth contained in the Word, thereby receives Grace. Because the Word is the channel of Grace, the preacher of the Word is the most important human agent in the divine economy of salvation, the teaching of the Word is the most important function of the preacher, and pure doctrine (or an accurate

representation of the Word) is the *sine qua non* of the Sacraments and of an experience of salvation. Thus Calvin spoke of "teaching" in virtually every context in which "preaching" would have been appropriate. He accepted the recitation of the Catechism as a valid profession of faith. He condemned false *teachers* (Servetus) above all criminals. Thus, too, the communion of saints, as the *milieu* within which teaching occurs, is exalted, and the church, as the *communio sanctorum*, becomes essential to salvation.

In short, John Calvin believed that a child of God was one who had been taught, who had experienced thereby the coercive action of the truth of God contained in the proximate Word, had reached an understanding of the truth of God by the internal testimony of the Holy Spirit and thus had attained a vital faith identifiable with "knowledge" which was essentially acknowledgment, love and trust. Because, for him, the process involved a vital, "substantial" union with Christ, the *Communio Sanctorum*, with its dynamic interrelations, became an essential context.

In the main, this study has taken for its sources the everyday fruits of Calvin's teaching ministry: his sermons, commentaries, homilies and lectures, together with the records and minutes of the various ecclesiastical bodies of Geneva.

"Bossuet and the Protestants: A Chapter in the Seventeenth Century Struggle for Religious Allegiance in France." By James M. Moudy (Dean, Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, N. C.) Duke University 1953. Director: Ray C. Petry.

Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet (1627-1704) was one of those clerics closest to Louis XIV in the years leading up to his 1685 revocation of Henry IV's Edict of Nantes. Twice bishop, preacher extraordinary, preceptor to the

Dauphin, irenic polemicist, he was French Protestantism's most effective religious opponent. He strongly championed conciliarism and opposed the rising doctrine of papal infallibility. No studies of Bossuet's work have been published in this country, and in England only a handful have been printed in this century. The large collection of Bossuet materials in Duke University Library furnished the unusual opportunity for this study.

Bossuet was born at Dijon, studied in Paris, at Navarre, and received a doctorate in 1652, without first-hand contact with Protestantism. Metz, where Bossuet claimed a benefice at twenty-five, was a Protestant stronghold, and here Bossuet had his first real encounter with the rival system, an encounter occasioned by an intemperate catechism of the Protestant pastor Paul Ferry which claimed salvation was no longer possible through Rome. Bossuet penned a refutation, which though irenic and polished, was as jejune in argument as Ferry's. But it did demonstrate a naive but sincere belief which Bossuet never outgrew, namely, that ignorance and blindness had caused the Protestant schism, and that clear and kindly restatements of the Roman position would draw all men back into the Catholic fold.

Bossuet came to the attention of the court by his eloquence and became one of its designated preachers. More attention came when the startling conversion of the Protestant Marshal Turenne was credited largely to Bossuet and to his *Exposition de la Doctrine de l'Eglise Catholique*. Bossuet was rewarded with a bishopric and with the preceptorship of the Dauphin. During the decade of preceptorship, he engaged in little preaching or in work which would bring him into contact with Protestants. However, he disputed privately with Jean Claude, who from 1670 until the Revocation was the soul of French Protestantism. Both men later went into print, voluminously, with their versions of the debate. Bossuet, who in his *Exposition* appeared to believe the Eucharist to be the main point of argument, now saw that the main point of divergence lay

in the doctrine of the church. Fénelon realized that this work (*Conférence avec Claude*) was Bossuet's finest, and because later scholars have all but ignored it, this dissertation gives it a fairly thorough hearing.

Bossuet's part in the Revocation is judged to be exceedingly small, with first blame going to Louis himself, second to the French clergy, third to Huguenot provocations, and last to Rome and Bossuet. He had already produced a work (*Politique tirée des Propres Paroles de l'Ecriture Sainte*) which is the classical statement on the divine right of kings and which dealt thoroughly with Louis' right and duty toward heretics. Bossuet's rationalization of Revocation lacked only a detailed arraignment of Protestants as heretics, and this he performed in his remarkably careful and documented history of Protestantism (*Histoire des Variations des Eglises Protestantes*). Until his death he labored mightily in his diocese to attempt to assimilate without force the former Protestants who had not fled, and there is almost no record of any violence carried out by the *dragonnades* in his area, despite Baird's use of a few shreds of evidence to support a contrary conclusion.

Within Bossuet's lifetime and partly by his efforts, France was saved from Protestantism. Whether it was saved for Catholicism will have to be answered by students of the modern period.

"The Problem of Revelation and Reason in the Thought of Charles Chauncy." By Norman Brantley Gibbs (First Presbyterian Church, Jackson, Tenn.). Duke University, 1953. Director: H. Shelton Smith.

No definitive evaluation of Chauncy's contribution to American religious thought has been published. The underlying purpose of this dissertation is to invite others to establish a first-hand acquaintance with a significant attempt to reinterpret the seventeenth century Puritan teaching concerning reason and revelation in the light of eighteenth century rationalism and the emotionalism of the Great Awakening.

Chauncy's answer to the double challenge of the Awakening and the Enlightenment was inspired by the writings of John Locke, John Taylor, John Tillotson, and Richard Baxter. Their views of revelation and reason illuminate Chauncy's discussions on the subject. For that reason, a comparison of their views with his is offered at several points.

Man's nature, in his view, is enfeebled by the fall, and, inevitably, further corrupted by individual sin. At the same time, he stressed the rational and moral abilities retained by fallen man. His version of the universal, though corruptible, moral sense amounts to an affirmation of a moral *a priori* element in man. His initial Lockian psychology is transformed by this principle. He took a lower view of "natural religion" than did Tillotson or even Baxter, and he affirmed the qualitative difference between "natural" and "revealed" religion.

Like Baxter, he emphasized the corrupting effect of universal sin upon man's reason, and the rectification of reason through sanctification. Conversion alone is not sufficient for this end.

Christ is the one Mediator through whose sacrificial and atoning death all men must be saved.

Chauncy agreed with Chillingworth, Hooker, and Baxter as to the initial role of reason in the recognition of the authority of Scripture. He then affirmed John Owen's view of the decisive character of the internal evidence and the witness of the Spirit. The intrinsic truth of the Gospel in the Scriptures is its ultimate authority. Understood in this manner, the biblical revelation is supreme in religion.

The culmination of revelation and reason is saving faith. It is the product of the Spirit's illumination of the Gospel in the Scripture to corrected reason. Faith begins in the understanding and fills the heart and life through it. The emotions of fear and love may move the reason toward the acceptance of revelation. However, no irrational approach to faith is possible; it cannot be a blind leap. "Common faith" is intellectual assent only. "Special faith" is the total response of the whole person to God's revelation. The sphere of the latter is the total life and all of life's relationships.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs. By DR. M. DE JONGE. Assen, Holland: van Gorcum, 1953. Pp. 184. Unbound, 9.50 guilders; bound, 10.90.

For readers of *Church History* the importance of de Jonge's book lies not so much in its examination of the textual tradition of the Testaments and its rejection of the independent testimony of the Armenian version as in the conclusions the author draws from this evidence. He goes on to argue (a) that there is almost no textual evidence for Christian interpolations and remarkably little evidence of any kind for them, and that (b) we have the *Testaments* (in a Cambridge manuscript on which Grabe and Sinker based their editions) just about as they were written. Therefore the *Testaments* are a Christian work, composed with lavish use of Jewish sources between 190 and 225 A.D.

The remarkably careful textual and literary analysis of the *Testaments* certainly points to the conclusion that they are Christian, and even should Hebrew or Aramaic *Testaments* turn up among the Dead Sea Scrolls, such evidence would not disprove de Jonge's arguments concerning the *Testaments* we have. I am not convinced, however, that they need to be dated as late as 190. He points out that they are first mentioned by Origen in his *Homilies on Joshua* 15, 6 (pp. 121-28), and lists five points which correspond to the Old Testament exegesis of Hippolytus. However, the notion that Satan rules the tribe of Dan is presumably older than the Irenaeus passage de Jonge quotes; the notion that Joseph was a type of Christ is found already in Justin's *Dialogue*; and the other three items impress me as bits of exegesis which could have been produced by any Christian exegete of the second century. The fact that some of them specifically occur

for the first time in Hippolytus should not be taken to mean that Hippolytus was actually the first to use them, and—*pace* de Jonge—he may well have used the *Testaments*. The other parallels he provides throughout his study suggest that the *Testaments* could easily come from the middle of the second century, when a lively interest in Jewish haggadah is reflected by Justin (and, a generation later, by Theophilus).

DeJonge's study is a model of method in textual and literary analysis, and its historical conclusion is of great importance in tying some more of the strings which bind second-century Judaism and Christianity together. There must have been far more communication between Jews and Christians during this period than was once supposed, and along with the line of Ignatius, Barnabas, and the anti-Jewish gnostics there was another line, held for example by Hermes, Justin (in part), the *Testaments*, and Theophilus. In addition, we now know that speculative Judaism strongly influenced Valentinus (in the *Gospel of Truth*; cf. Puech and Quispel in *Vigiliae Christianae* 1954, 22-39). We must remember that Marcion was expelled from the Roman church, even at the price of 200,000 sesterces!

ROBERT M. GRANT
University of Chicago.

The Broadening Church: A Study of Theological Issues in the Presbyterian Church Since 1869. By LEFFERTS A. LOETSCHER. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954. 195 pp. \$4.75.

The Associate Professor of Church History at Princeton Seminary here discusses theological issues in the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. since 1869. This is not a history of that Church's theology, but an appraisal of the forces which in the last century have challenged its theology, and the

varied reactions of different elements within the Church.

The thesis is that the theological history of the denomination has revolved around two main groups; one with a Scottish and Scotch-Irish nucleus stressing "precise theological formulation, the professional and distinct character of the ministry, and orderly and authoritarian church government"; the other with a New England, English and Welsh core emphasizing "spontaneity, vital impulse, and adaptability." It is claimed that these groups, having separated twice before 1869, have also been responsible for the chief theological tensions within the Church since that time. The struggle occurred in two main phases. The first, from 1889 to 1903, focussed on the trials of Professors Briggs, Smith and McGiffert, and resulted in the almost complete triumph of the conservatives. The second, from 1922 to 1936, began with the Fosdick case in New York and terminated in the withdrawal of the Church's extreme right wing headed by J. Gresham Machen. The really decisive forces, we are told, were not theological but ecclesiastical, leading to a more inclusive churchmanship tolerant of divergent viewpoints. It is alleged that Princeton Seminary with its uncompromising defense of Biblical inerrancy was a determinative factor in the struggle, the Church as a whole at first approving and later repudiating this stand.

Dr. Loetscher presents a fairly convincing case for his theory of the liberal-conservative alignment within the Church being a continuation of the earlier New School-Old School division, while conceding that the identification cannot be pressed too far. With all the exceptions that must be made, however, it would appear that further investigation is needed before the thesis is accepted as proved. On the issues which proved most controversial during the period covered by this study the two groups seem, at first, to have been in essential agreement. It is probably true, however, that in the long run the New School tradition was somewhat more flexible.

One is surprised at the tenacity of conservative opinion within the Church in the early twentieth century. At a time when most Presbyterian bodies in the Anglo-Saxon world were discreetly avoiding dogmatic pronouncements on controverted theological issues, the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. was committing itself unequivocally. It is ironic that the Adopting Act of 1729, designed to permit some breadth of interpretation by requiring conformity to the Westminster Standards only in "essential and necessary articles of faith" proved a bulwark to the conservatives in the early 1900's by permitting them to define these articles in ultra-conservative terms.

The book is interestingly written and carefully documented, with extensive use of contemporary sources. Not all of its conclusions will pass unchallenged, but it is a noteworthy contribution to our understanding of this largest branch of American Presbyterianism.

H. KEITH MARKELL

*Presbyterian College
Montreal, Canada*

Das Selbstzeugnis Kaiser Konstantins, By HERMANN DÖRRIES, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, 1954, pp. 431.

If we would understand Constantine, we must listen to Constantine. The first step is to assemble, sift and study all of the utterances attributed to him. There are many, and most are not in doubt. The letters concerned with the Donatist and Arian schisms are not impugned, nor the speech at Nicaea. Six other documents have been called into question. Among them the most important are the *Oratio ad Sanctorum Coetum* and the letter to Sapor. Professor Dörries brings all of these to the test of the undisputed documents and concludes that even in the case of the most dubious the considerations in favor outweigh those to the contrary. In addition to these letters and speeches, there are laws and inscrip-

tions. The total body of material is impressive.

On the basis of so much evidence a plausible picture can be reconstructed of Constantine's own view of his role in history, of his aspirations, his attitude to the Christian Church and to the Christian religion. The traditional picture of syncretism is confirmed, though in subtler forms than has commonly been supposed, for Constantine was no less an intellectual than Julian the Apostate. In accord with Hellenistic thought Constantine preferred to speak of God in abstract terms as providence. This divine being created the world and men and takes cognizance of their behavior. Those who worship him aright are vindicated. The true manner of his worship has been disclosed through the sending of His son, who has also confirmed the law of nature through His teaching and example. His miracles were declaratory of His power and pre-eminently the miracle of the Resurrection by which He triumphed over death and bestows upon His followers the gift of immortality. Christ had to die in order that He might rise, but His death has no other significance. The cross plays no part in the theology of Constantine. God allowed the followers of Christ to be persecuted but at length raised up a champion in the person of Constantine and called him by a definite experience, which he regretted not to have received earlier. By virtue of this call Constantine became the man of God or servant of God, and, because of his loyalty to the true worship, God granted him victory over all his foes.

His mission thereafter was to restore vitality to ancient Rome and to inaugurate an age of peace and amity. This should be done by combining the classical virtues of concord and magnanimity with the Christian qualities of meekness, forgiveness and love. In this program Constantine expected to be aided by the Christian Church. He looked upon the bishops as with him co-servants of God. Their judgment in matters spiritual was to be esteemed as highly as that of Christ and in civil affairs even more highly than that of secular magistrates. Paganism

should not be eradicated by the state, though in a measure restricted. Ultimately it would have to be overcome by the persuasiveness of the true religion of which Constantine in the letter to Sapor, the Persian, announced himself as a missionary.

This picture which Constantine draws of himself is roughly confirmed by the *Vita* from the pen of Eusebius, the genuineness of which is defended. The vision of the cross, however, may be called into doubt because the cross had so little significance for Constantine, but the fact of a conversion is substantiated. This body of material suggests to the reviewer that Constantine deliberately attempted to curb in some measure those three tendencies which Rostovzeff claimed to have been dominant in the three hundred years prior to his accession, namely the barbarization of the army, the militarization of the state and the orientalizing of the Emperor. Constantine proclaimed himself as the restorer of ancient Rome and reproved Licinius for introducing barbarian legislation. Secondly, although, of course, he did not dismiss the army, he introduced a counterpoise by conferring upon the bishops a significant measure of civil administration and, although the cultus of the Emperor was not entirely abandoned, Constantine made a tremendous break when he renounced his claim to divinity.

This total body of material thus so assiduously collected and rigorously examined gives one a deeper sense of confidence with regard to the picture of the first Christian Emperor.

ROLAND H. BAINTON
Yale Divinity School

Tello and Theotonio, the Twelfth-century Founders of the Monastery of Santa Cruz in Coimbra. E. AUSTIN O'MALLEY. Washington, D. C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1954. vii, 178 pp. \$2.00.

Despite the ecclesiastical title, Brother O'Malley's dissertation is also an important contribution to the early political history of Portugal. Prior Theotonio (1082-1162) lived not only

about the time in which *Infante* or *Príncipe* Afonso Henriques broke away from ties with Castile and assumed the title of king as of a separate state (ca. 1140), but also during the the Second Crusade, the sole success of which was the liberation of Lisbon from Islamic rule. Archdeacon Tello (1076-1136) did not live to see the independence of his country, but certainly had a share in that achievement. Part of the movement toward national differentiation was the struggle to secure the privileges of the monastery of Santa Cruz, of which King Afonso I was a patron and benefactor. Ultimately it became the first monastery in Portugal under the protection of the Holy See (1135). Eight years afterward the nation itself became a fief of the papacy. To some degree both accomplishments were the labor of the same interested parties. "The history of the monastery ran parallel to the history of the young kingdom, and the success of one became the success of the other" (pp. 116f.).

Both Tello and Theotonio had traveled widely; both had, for example, been to Palestine. But Tello was the active "Martha" of their establishment and Theotonio was the contemplative "Mary." Tello was concerned about construction of buildings; Theotonio, about the interior life of the institution. That is not to assert, of course, an absolute division of labor, because the result was a cooperative effort of two men devoted to God and Holy Church. The constitution of the organization was based on the customal of Saint Ruf at Avignon, which in turn drew upon the Rules of Saint Augustine, of Saint Chrodegang of Metz, and of the Council of Aix-la-Chapelle (816/817). The favor exhibited toward the new foundation by Saint Bernard of Clairvaux is significant, especially since he was of the strict observance while Santa Cruz was of the moderate persuasion. Even Saint Bernard was perhaps aware that not all men could be Cistercians, although he appeared frequently to equate Christianity itself with monachism.

The author narrates (p. 143) a

simple story of the capture of one of the canons of Santa Cruz by Saracen brigands. The prisoner was taken by the bandits to the city of Elvas, then still in Muslim hands. The date was 1148. Through the prayers of Prior Theotonio the man was at length released. I was particularly drawn to that brief account because of the date and the name of the town. Four centuries later a knight of the same town whose name is uncertain published his *True Relation* of the famed De Soto expedition of which he had been one of the numerous Portuguese cavaliers. In that volume and other similar ones American Indian temples are usually referred to as "mosques." The lapse of four hundred years between the days of Theotonio and the *conquistadores* had not effaced the grim memory of Moorish captivity.

Two remarks seem to deserve special attention not for any intrinsic originality but for our frequent neglect of them. The first is the reminder (p. 99) that occasionally in the twelfth century kings in Spain employed the title *emperor* (the *Roman emperor*—holy or otherwise—was by no means the only claimant to that designation, as we all too often tend to forget). The second is expressed (p. 94) in an alleged boast of Archbishop João Peculiar of Braga that "in his own land he alone was pope" (when considering medieval anti-papalism let us not ignore the unguarded statements of many metropolitan prelates).

Brother O'Malley's book is a fine tribute to the director of his thesis, Father Ziegler of the Catholic University of America.

ALLEN CABANISS
University, Mississippi

The Bequines and Beghards in Medieval Culture with special emphasis on the Belgian scene. By ERNEST W. McDONNELL. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1954. xvii & 643 pages. \$10.00.

Strictly speaking, this is less a review than a set of observations on a treasury of researches in an unexploit-

ed field. The work is fascinating enough to be read through in a single sitting, if 574 crowded pages of highly documented materials were susceptible of that. Actually, the very wealth of suggestive leads and scarcely tapped literature conduces more to re-reading and resavoring than to finishing and criticizing.

The author makes it clear that here is no first venture into an esoteric field. The brotherhoods and sisterhoods here studied have not been unexplored. Neither have they been depicted, however, in properly balanced, historical perspective—not even in continental literature; certainly not in English. The purpose here is “first, to present to the English reader the beguine-beghard movement broadly conceived as a cultural force, and secondly, to examine immediately, with the desirability of a synthetic treatment in mind, the three types of sources: 1) hagiographical and literary references; 2) the Roman bullarium, conciliar legislation, and chronicles; and 3) testaments, property deeds, and town ordinances” (p. viii). This is indeed a many-sided investigation to be reduced at the greatest peril from its natural complexities to any easily observable simplicity. The author withholds no tribute of appreciation for past labors whether it concerns the rather more researched beguine movement or the less intensively studied beguards. The rich diversity of Mr. McDonnell's book is evidence of his own refusal to over-generalize.

The sweep of this investigation is amply disciplined in its systematic subdivisions and in its almost unexcelled source-secondary documentation. In its six parts, the book examines, first, “A Case Study In The *Vita Apostolica*.” Accented here are the primacy of the Oignies-Sur-Sambre coenobium of St. Nicholas, especially in relation to Mary; the Belgian career of the versatile Jacques de Vitry under Mary's influence; together with spiritual curacy, and the discipline of the semi-religious of Oignies and Nivelles. “The Puritan Ethic in Liege” is illuminating.

Part II is a painstaking inquiry

into “The Extraregular in State and Society”—unquestionably one of the strongest sections of the book. The consideration of “Social Origins: The *Frauenfrage*” is a model of balanced, scholarly appraisal of divergent theses as they involve the roles of wealth, poverty, and religious motivation interacting on the social scene. Such chapters as those on the *via media*, apostolic poverty, and hierarchial protection are balanced in excellence with those considering the relationship of brotherhoods and sisterhoods to indulgences, interdict, royal patronage, and industry.

Part III, on “Spiritual Currents in Belgium and Rhineland” has a provocative treatment of “Hildegard of Bingen and Belgian Mysticism,” as well as a lead analysis of Beguine-Cistercian spirituality. Because of his own large interest in the mendicant orders, medieval preaching, and mysticism, the present reviewer finds the first three parts—especially I, iii, II, i-v, III, i, iv, the most rewarding of the entire book. But even such chapters as those on Dominican preaching, and Meister Eckhart on pastoral care, cannot rightfully obscure the pertinence of the last three parts, with their large bearing on problems of devotional literature, heresy, and inquisition.

The strength and weakness of this book are well-nigh one. It is the exhaustive, yet ever unexhausted, researching of the book into less known phenomena, especially in the Belgian quarter, that impedes any clear impact in the form of inescapable, basic conclusions. Yet this is far from fatal in a work whose greatest contribution is a patient, unhurried, setting down of the maddeningly incoercible and ungeneralizable interactions of personal-social experience.

This is a good example of the cumulative fruitage borne by generations of good teaching and research, the reciprocal buttressing of academic foundations and subsidized university presses, and the mutualizing benefits for all historical fields of solid research in any one field. This reviewer will consistently revert to this book, in teaching and research, for a variety of in-

sights into medieval liturgy, canon law, economic-social theory, monasticism, mysticism, and predication—all of these intimately related to ecclesiastical history. Text, notes, bibliographies, indexes, print and type, make this a stellar publication.

RAY C. PETRY

Duke University

"Luther als Ausleger der Synoptiker," *Forschungen zur Geschichte und Lehre des Protestantismus*, Zehnte Reihe, Band V. By WALTHER VON LOEWENICH. München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1954, pp. 303.

Modern Roman Catholic polemic has availed itself of that recent Biblical criticism which sees within the New Testament itself Christian varieties. That being the case, if Luther was an extreme Paulinist, he must have neglected variant and valid aspects of the gospel. Professor Loewenich, concerned with this problem, addressed himself earlier to the Johannine element in Luther's theology. Here he turns to the Synoptics. He finds that Luther was so full orb'd in his theology that he does indeed import Pauline and Johannine elements into the Synoptic interpretation. But conversely he brings the Synoptics into play in interpreting the rest. The first three Gospels enable him, in accord with the Chalcedonian doctrine of the two natures, to picture the human side of Christ with great vividness and concrete detail, often elaborated by a lively imagination within a German setting. The weakest aspect of Luther's Synoptic interpretation is at the point of those passages which inculcate good works and offer a reward for their performance. Luther invariably insists that the good work is the fruit of faith and the reward is an act of grace rather than the genuine recognition of merit. Nor is Luther quite at home in early Christian eschatology. He was closer, of course, in this regard to the New Testament than were those who allegorized eschatology altogether, for Luther did believe in the literal and not-too-distant coming of the Lord Jesus. Neverthe-

less, in the interim he had a doctrine of the two kingdoms of a sort only faintly adumbrated in the New Testament. All in all, however, one may say that Luther discovered in the Synoptics his entire theology, sometimes by doing a measure of violence to the text, but often by reason of deep study and profound insight.

Quotations from Luther in this work by reason of space are scant, but references to his writings are copious.

ROLAND H. BAINTON
Yale Divinity School

The History and Character of Calvinism. By JOHN T. McNEILL. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954. 466 pp. \$6.00.

Here is another valuable product of the alert scholarship of John T. McNeill. We have before us a carefully organized and well-written text of 500 pages, heavily packed with historical facts, covering the history of Reformed Protestantism from its inception in the sixteenth-century up to the present day. As the dust-jacket affirms, it is a text which the layman, as well as the student and pastor, can read. But the reading goes slowly, though not monotonously. There is an appealing precision, vigor, and movement to the writing. The reader's interest is constantly stirred: he wants to push on to see the story completed. And he is abundantly rewarded for his time and effort.

The book consists of four Parts. In Part I, McNeill tells in detail the story of the first of the two chief movements which constituted Reformed Protestantism. He gives a sketch of the ecclesiastical and political situation in German Switzerland prior to the Reformation, directing our attention to the rise of humanism and biblical scholarship, which formed a part of Zwingli's background. After outlining Zwingli's family background and education, the Reformer's exciting career in Glarus, Einsiedeln, and Zurich is presented. Zwingli's determined evangelical leadership, pivoted upon preaching from Scriptural sources, and his solid Biblical scholarship are clear-

ly and interestingly described. The author draws carefully a picture of the Reformer's problems and leadership in the face of both Roman and Swiss opposition, Anabaptist enthusiasm, and other troublesome issues such as the recruiting of mercenary troops. Zwingli's life comes to a thundering close on the battlefield, where he dies a Christian death but with Socratic words on his lips: "They may kill the body, but not the soul." A separate chapter is devoted mainly to Bullinger's subsequent leadership, with some attention given to the work of Capito, Bucer, and Oecolampadius. This part of the story of the origin of Reformed Protestantism is brought to an end with a survey of the transformations which were effected in doctrine, the use of Scripture, discipline, and worship up to the time of the formulation of the First Helvetic Confession (1536).

In Part II, "Calvin and the Reformation in Geneva," the author traces in nine chapters the life and work of John Calvin, who headed the second of the great movements which formed Reformed Protestantism. We learn of Calvin's educational experiences at the Collège des Capettes, the University of Paris, Orléans, Bourges, and finally at the College of Royal Lecturers. As the story is told, Calvin's relations with the de Hangest family, Olivétan, the Cop family, Budé, Wolmar and others are brought to our attention. His humanist period finds its culmination in the *Seneca Commentary* (1532), which was singularly unsuccessful despite its merits. The author describes the forces at work on Calvin leading to his "sudden conversion," which is probably to be dated in 1534 near the time of an interview with Lefèvre. McNeill devotes a single chapter to the production and literary history of the *Institutes* (1536-1559). Special notice is taken of the literary importance of the first French version (1541). The author discusses the significance of the text and preface of the *Institutes* but there is no extended treatment at this point of Calvin's theology. A later chapter discusses in brief some of the salient features of Calvin's theological position. The Reformer's call by Farel

to work in Geneva, his early work there, the production of his *Instruction in Faith*, and the struggle between Calvin and the Geneva councils which led to his ouster (1538) are vividly set forth. A chapter recounts his Strasbourg activities. Following a description of Calvin's return to Geneva (1541), the author treats in some detail the important *Ordinances of the Church of Geneva* and carries forward the story of his leadership to the time when Geneva was a highly instructed and disciplined Christian community. Episodes dealing with Calvin's relations with Castellio, Pierre Ameaux, the Perrin faction, and Michael Servetus enliven the account of his Geneva struggles. By 1555 Calvin's grasp on Geneva was secure. Other chapters in this Part describe Calvin's sway over Geneva, his role as a writer and theologian, his personality and historical importance. The section on Calvin's personality is an engaging and persuasive argument that there were elements of tolerance, esthetic appreciation, and friendliness in the Reformer—characteristics for which he is only infrequently given credit.

Part III is entitled, "The Spread of Reformed Protestantism in Europe and America." In France the account ranges from the days of Francis I, through the bloody Huguenot period, to the beginning of the eighteenth century, shortly after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Beginning with the spadework done by the brotherhood movements in the Netherlands, McNeill traces the rise and spread of the Reformed movement in that territory, taking up in their places the Arminian controversy and the Synod of Dort, and closes the story near the end of the seventeenth century. Other chapters in this Part deal with the history of the Reformed movement in Germany, Scotland, England, Ireland, and America.

Finally, Part IV tells of the fragmentation of Calvinism during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, with emphasis on the churches in Scotland and America. There is a treatment of subsequent movements toward reunion and ecumenicity. A chapter

is devoted to the impact of philosophical and scientific advances (e.g., Cartesianism, Deism, Schleiermacher's philosophy, Biblical criticism, et cetera) upon Calvinism. The history of the mutual relations between Calvinism and politico-economic thought and affairs is traced. The text closes with a stimulating chapter on the spirit of Calvinism in contradistinction to its outward forms, on its relation to the theological movement stemming from Barth, on its expression in contemporary Calvin scholarship, and on its perennial religious and cultural values. So one may say of it as Zwingli said at his hour of death, "They may kill the body, but not the spirit."

The four Parts of the text are of approximately equal length. The continuity of McNeill's story is not interrupted by massive or technical footnotes: there are only a half-dozen in the whole text. The reviewer discovered only a few minor typographical errors. The printing and binding jobs are good. A valuable index is appended to the text. For each Part a selected bibliography of 30 to 50 titles is given.

This book should find extensive use as an authoritative textbook and reference volume in its field.

WALTER E. STUERMANN
University of Tulsa

Hugh Latimer, Apostle to the English. By ALLAN G. CHESTER. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1954. x-261 pages.

Latimer's service to the English Reformation was primarily that of a preacher. Having become an ardent convert to a scriptural faith, he thought of preaching as the exposition and forthright application of Holy Writ. It was in 1524, under the zealous persuasion of Thomas Bilney, that, as he says, he "began to smell the word of God." He remained ever after deeply grateful to "little Bilney, that blessed martyr of God," who for the few years left to him became Latimer's friend and companion. Professor Chester regards as highly suspect the oft-told picturesque anecdotes, recorded in a Harleian manuscript, of Latimer's

appearances shortly after his conversion before Bishop Nicholas West of Ely and Cardinal Wolsey. There are vivid elements left, however, in Latimer's associations with the imperilled Cambridge gospellers of whom Bilney was chief. It was in this group that, in this reviewer's judgment, the English Reformation had its real beginning; and it consisted of men who had been stirred much more by the New Testament of Erasmus than by Luther's treatises. It was on reading in Erasmus' text, "Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners," that Bilney's own deeply troubled soul found "a marvelous comfort and quietness." Latimer shared with the others this ardor for the Christ of the New Testament, without yet caring to translate the experience into the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith. As in the case of Cranmer, whose influence he strongly felt, his adoption of elements of the Continental Reformation was cautious and halting.

As university preacher, Latimer became the outstanding spokesman of the Cambridge brotherhood. He was in accord with Cranmer also in unhesitating support of England's withdrawal from papal obedience. He rose in King Henry's favor, but he did not always obey the royal wish. Thus Chester makes it evident that he took ground against the suppression of Tyndale's Bible, and was probably the anonymous author of an eloquent plea to the king for the authorization of the Scripture in English (1530). Even when at the close of an exhausting trial before Bishop Stokesley he was induced to make humiliating concessions, he was not compelled to declare, as was another in the same situation, against the circulation of the Bible to the lay people. After he had become bishop of Worcester, Latimer preached his famous Convocation sermon (1536), an utterance of great boldness favoring the scriptures and castigating abuses. The same insistence on the Bible as the agency of reform is seen in his episcopal injunctions of 1537.

He was no less deeply convinced that the Holy Scriptures are to be preached than that they are to be read.

The effectiveness of his own sermons—attested by many who felt their potent persuasion—was such as to confirm his belief in the value of a devout and vigilant preaching ministry. He cried out against the unpreaching prelates and held them up to public scorn. His episcopate was cut short through the shifting policy of Henry and the manipulations of Thomas Cromwell, and his reforming aims were largely thwarted during Henry's later years. It was in the first half of Edward VI's reign that his unique preaching talents found fullest expression. For about two years he preached frequently at the court.

Describing one of Latimer's best-known sermons of this period, Professor Chester remarks:

Its greatest merit, however, is the lively concreteness which, even in those parts which are most theological, remains picturesque and colorful after the lapse of four centuries. (p. 165).

Our author has here identified the principal mark of Latimer's literary genius, the same quality is present in the greater part of the preserved sermon texts. It is not destroyed even where the shorthand writer, in desperation at the preacher's fluency, left gaps, nor is it wholly lost where the admiring editor, the Swiss-born Augustine Bernher, retouched the language for Elizabethan readers. Bernher had been Latimer's familiar disciple. Dr. Chester quotes his description of his master's devout, laborious and virtuous life. "If ever England had a prophet," he exclaims, "this was one."

Dr. Chester does not allow us to view the great preacher as a sinless saint. But the characterization he adopts, "Apostle to the English," is another phrase borrowed from his admiring contemporaries. Chester is meticulous in handling his sources; he so fills his pages with the minor data necessary to clarify the uncertainties left by his predecessors, that generalizations are largely hidden away. But we do see throughout the impressive figure of a fearless man who preached with directness, penetration and ready wit a gospel of personal salvation and of

social justice, believing, as Chester puts it, that "in preaching lay England's hope."

JOHN T. MCNEILL
Emory University

Science and Religion in Elizabethan England. By PAUL H. KOCHER. The Huntington Library, San Marino, California, 1953, pp. XII, 340, \$6.00.

Professor Kocher says that by Elizabethan he means roughly 1550 to 1610, the period which sets in soon after the death of Copernicus and ends just before Galileo's work begins. Though he makes excursions into the years before and after this period, he does it rarely and only when the impulse is irresistible. On the showing his materials are so varied and suggestive that one is tempted to go exploring in them on one's own.

Here are the chapter headings: Elizabethan Science, Handmaid or Mistress; Theory of Knowledge; Skepticism; The Limits of Science; Providence, Natural Causation, and Miracle; Satan Exiled; The Old Heaven and Earth; New Cosmos; Copernicanism and the Bible; Astrological Fate; Man the Composite; The Physician as Atheist; God in Medicine; Body and Soul; The Grace of God.

This book illustrates how far we have come since A. D. White's *Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom* (1896). It is true that Kocher deals with a few decades, and with one country, while White covered Western civilization across many centuries. But there is a difference in method: Kocher is widely read not only in the Elizabethan scientists but also in its theological, homiletical, and devotional writers. His study is one of earnest historical induction. White, on the other hand, looked for evidence to sustain his thesis, and he handled it like a prosecuting attorney. Many theologians of the post-Darwin era perhaps deserved and needed the shock he gave them, but he did a disservice to scientists by unduly feeding their vanity. Kocher has done much better. To begin with, he knows a vast deal about historical theology from diligent

reading in theologians. He found that the competent theologians were men of wide learning, that sometimes they were in their own right as much scientists as theologians.

The author sets up no straw men. The duel between science and theology is real enough, but it seems almost never to involve all of theology or all of science. Sometimes the duel is fought within one and the same man. The new science does indeed thrust powerfully at some older theological ideas. Its sword was the long and broad blade of a new reverence for matter and natural law. Take the question of Satan. Kocher is well aware that Elizabethans had not arrived at the conclusion of denying his existence. This sort of thing happened later, in the 17th and 18th century, when intellectuals had built of the new naturalism a philosophy. Not so the Elizabethans, who had little inclination to deny Satan's part in the spiritual temptation of man. This they left to divinity. But his supposed interference in the natural order was another matter. Theology has long held that though Satan could do no miracles he could perform wonders (storms, pestilence, possession, etc.). But as psychology, meteorology, and medicine advanced the belief about Satan manipulating nature died of neglect. Largely unaffected remained that area of reflection which pertained to moral evil or sin, whose enormity was such that extrahuman forces might have to be reckoned with.

Professor Kocher is clearly a dualist who resolutely rejects pure materialism as inadequate to account for the nature of man. It is evident, however, that this does not weight his scales in favor of his faith. The man who would write the new *Summa Theologica* for which he calls must possess a good measure of the author's temper of mind.

It may be asked whether the title of this book might not better be *Science and Theology in Elizabethan England*. While religion is indeed the issue at stake, science makes its brush with it on theological points. In this at least I take Andrew D. White to have been more accurate. It may also be asked

whether theology ought not to be qualified by an adjective, *Science and Natural Theology*, or even *Science and Christian Concepts of Natural Theology*. It seems that no issue was raised involving the mysteries of the Christian faith, such as the deity of Christ, the believer's mystical union with Christ, sacraments, and the like. The crucial points rather belong to a general body of belief which constitutes the connection of Christianity with Judaism, Islam, paganism and heathenism. The notion of man as a soul-body complex got its first formulation in Aristotle rather than in Christian writers. Providence was a Stoical concept. It is true that Christians developed these ideas, so that, e.g., general providence became particular providence; but for all its profounder meaning particular providence still belongs to natural theology. Any new *Summa* will grow in substance from a clear distinction between that which is general and that which pertains to the faith's mysteries. It is the more true today when natural theology constitutes one of the fronts on which not only Christianity but other religions depend for survival.

This book appeared about the same time as Professors Bainton's and O'Malley's studies on Servetus. It is thus another recent testimony to the light which can fall on the history of science from responsible acquaintance with theology. Too, it exemplifies the kind of probing to be done on a larger scale of the mind of Renaissance men.

The Huntington Library is to be complimented on the format and printing, which are worthy of so good a book.

QUIRINUS BREEN

University of Oregon

Congregationalism: A Restatement.
By DANIEL T. JENKINS. New York:
Harper & Bros., 152 pp., \$2.00.

Daniel Jenkins has written another book which calls upon the churches in the reformed tradition to evaluate their present life in the light of the meaning of their heritage. In this book, addressed particularly to Congregationalists in Great Britain and America,

Jenkins demonstrates the importance of going through the "traditioning" process that he has theologically defined in his *Tradition and the Spirit*. The book is within the interpretation of Congregationalism that has P. T. Forsyth as one of its inspirations, and emphasizes that congregational freedom is within a Christocentric faith, and exists under the Lordship of Christ. This means that a constant reformation must go on in the church, in part particularly directed to a reconsideration of the faith and life of the Puritans. They had no fear of confessing their faith in creeds, nor did they suffer under the illusion that the oneness of the faithful had no consequences for polity. The significance of a congregation seeking in church meeting what the gospel means for it is stressed.

Jenkins' book is not an historical study. There are brief sketches of aspects of Congregational history in relevant parts of the book, and frequent references are made to the Puritan past to illumine the constructive position. The way in which history is used is important. Unlike some persons who share his general interpretation of Congregationalism, Jenkins is not traditionalistic and pedantic in his use of Seventeenth Century literature. He writes out of a mind that has internalized significant meaning from Puritanism and the Reformation. Always history is in dialogue with the contemporary situation within the churches called Congregational and the complexities of modern society. Thus, for example, on theological grounds he shows how Congregational churches must "remain in communion of heart and mind with the rest of the great Church," (p. 86). This, on the level of polity, "means some voluntary surrender of sovereignty on the part of Congregationalism and its councils" to "more widely representative bodies which also possess a conciliar character" (p. 88). Jenkins then points out how this is not disloyalty, but a fulfillment of the heritage of the covenant idea in which Congregationalism emerged. By understanding the way in which faith, doctrine, polity and the

life of the times were conjoined in a significant church life in our heritage, we have an understanding of the present difficulties and insights into the most promising ways to face the future.

The book has unity, yet it is not repetitious. It can be read by interested laymen without too much difficulty. It is a timely book, given the intense conflict over self-definition in American Congregationalism.

JAMES GUSTAFSON
Yale Divinity School

A Tale of Two Brothers, John and Charles Wesley. By MABEL R. BRAILSFORD. New York: Oxford University Press, 1954. \$4.00.

It has been said of John Wesley "that he had almost no private life." For this reason, and also because what he had was not managed with conspicuous success, most writers on the Wesleys have paid only the inescapable minimum of attention to their personal relationships. In 1938 Mrs. Harrison attempted to make up the lack in her *Son to Susannah*. Now in *A Tale of Two Brothers* another Englishwoman attacks the same general problem, but from a slightly different angle. Miss Brailsford's main interest is in the relationship of the Wesley brothers to each other, though their relationships with women are of course included. As to the latter, Miss Brailsford accepts Mrs. Harrison's conclusion that John Wesley's ineptitude was due to a "mother fixation." In their relationships to each other, she finds a pattern: growing estrangement culminating in a breach. "The events and motives which occasioned this breach form the chief subject of this book . . ." (p. 11).

With fine psychological insight, Miss Brailsford traces the transformation of Charles' initial loyalty through revolt to determined independence of action. Especially illuminating is her treatment of Charles' amazing and disastrous interference in John's courtship of Grace Murray. Quite convincingly, she ascribes Charles precipitate and disreputable action in this affair to his deep sense of affront that John had failed to keep his side of their

agreement that each should consult the other before contemplating marriage. Surely, if his ostensible motive in preventing John's marriage, that is, concern lest the work suffer, were the primary one, the course he actually took tended rather toward its complete ruin. That it wasn't ruined is, as Miss Brailsford points out, something of a miracle in itself.

The question which brought about "the dissolution of the partnership" was that of loyalty to the Church of England. "To [Charles] the first object was the Church of England and the second the Methodists . . . John's first object was Methodism, to which the Church of England made a bad second" (p. 252). This is true enough; but it is not correct to ascribe John's reiterated loyalty to the Church of England to mere concessions to Charles' position on the matter, rather than to personal conviction. Granted that John's actions were at variance with his expressed loyalty to the Church; but that the latter was genuine and personal is shown by the fact that he steadfastly refused to consider separation from it even after Charles' death. That Charles co-operated less and less with John after the middle of the century is obvious; but I believe Miss Brailsford exaggerates the ef-

fect of this defection on John. He was disappointed, but not embittered or driven to despair by it, even momentarily. There is nothing in the record to show that either of the brothers doubted the other's affection. Miss Brailsford herself says (p. 276) "In private the loyalty of his [Charles'] heart never wavered." And less than two months after John had written the letter Miss Brailsford uses to illustrate his "despair" (pp. 254, 11), Charles wrote from London, "Last night my brother came. This morning we spent two blessed hours with George Whitefield. The three-fold cord, we trust, will never more be broken."

The errors of the *Tale of Two Brothers* are errors of emphasis. On the whole, as a psychological interpretation of two personalities who left formidably complex records behind them, it is extraordinarily illuminating. It not only treats a phase of their lives which has not adequately been treated before, it does it convincingly, and in a brilliant style which makes us wish that literary gifts were more frequently wedded, as here, with productive scholarship.

RICHARD CAMERON

Boston University School of Theology

MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

December 28, 1954

President Carl E. Schneider called the council to order at 6:30 P.M. in the Library of Hotel Roosevelt, New York, N. Y. with Robert T. Handy, Edward R. Hardy, Jr., Guy S. Klett, Sidney E. Mead, James H. Nichols, Wilhelm Pauck, Ray C. Petry, William W. Rockwell, Ernest Schwiebert and Raymond W. Albright present.

The council approved the minutes of its previous annual meeting held December 28, 1953, as printed in *Church History*, March, 1954.

The president named Robert T. Handy and Ernest Schwiebert to audit the books of the treasurer, whose report was heard by the council. The treasurer was authorized to raise the commission to publication agencies handling *Church History* to 10%. The council voted to order a study of our investments and that our committee on investments be reconstituted for this purpose, with specific instruction to study such investment programs as those of the TIAA and the CREF.

James H. Nichols reported for the editorial board. The council received the report and authorized the appropriation of \$2,700 for publishing *Church History* in 1955 and also the exchange of a maximum of ten copies of *Church History* with foreign societies and libraries.

Dr. Peter Fischer was authorized to represent the society at the 100th anniversary of Michigan State College on February 12, 1955.

After a discussion of the report of the committee in charge of the Zwingli Papers the council voted to authorize L. J. Trinterud to negotiate with publishers with a view to the publication of these materials.

The secretary read communications from Quirinus Breen setting out the activities and program of the society on the Pacific coast.

The secretary reported the deaths of J. M. Batten and Waldemar Gurian.

For failure to comply with the constitutional requirements the following persons were dropped from membership: George D. Alley, Charles E. Allred, Winslow E. Brown, Robert W. Coe, C. W. Fogelman, Earl H. Kauffman, Tristan P. Knight, Harold E. McNeil, Hugo J. Mierau, V. N. Mrvichin, Kermit D. Pugh, Arthur C. Repp, Leo E. Saidla, Leonard M. Schoonman, Alan Simpson, George Stob, Raymond H. Wood and Melton Wright.

The resignations of the following persons were accepted with regret: Roger Deschner, Gordon C. Frazee, C. M. Goethe, Colin B. Goodykoontz, Cecil W. Johnson, Willis J. Loar, Sidney C. McCammon, R. C. McMillan, H. O. Olson, W. G. Piersel, Nelson W. Rightmyer, William L. Thompson, John D. Trefzger, Robert M. Waugh, and William G. Ward.

The following persons, properly nominated, were elected members of the society, subject to the constitutional provision: Sydney E. Ahlstrom, Gerald H. Anderson, William A. Beal, Imri Blackburn, Robert J. Bull, R. D. Crouse, Emmet Eklund, Earl E. Eminhizer, William R. Estep, Jr., Deno Geanakoplos, G. Wayne Glick, Donald K. Gorrell, Walter J. Goerner, Kenneth L. Holmes, Joe Ben Irby, C. Norman Kraus, Byron C. Lambert, Milton F. LeCompte, Mae M. Link, William L. Lumpkin, Gene J. Lund, Archbishop Michael, John A. Miller, M. Jerry Neiwirth, Clyde K. Nelson, Leroy Nixon, O. R. Orr, Lloyd G. Patterson, Paul Peachy, Judson Purdy, Arthur O. Roberts, Walter P. Schoenfahs, Robert C. Senior, John W. V. Smith, W. Lyndon Smith, Herman Strub, Harry J. Sutcliffe, Seymour van Dyken, Frank F. White, Jr., and Frank Wray.

The council adjourned.

Attest: Raymond W. Albright
Secretary.

MINUTES OF THE SOCIETY

December 29, 1954

The seventy-seventh meeting of the society met in the small ball-room of the Hotel Roosevelt, New York, N. Y., under the chairmanship of president Carl E. Schneider, at 6:30 P.M.

The minutes of the previous annual meeting, on December 29, 1953, were approved as printed in *Church History*, March, 1954. The secretary reported the changes in the membership of the Society (see the minutes of the Council).

Treasurer Guy S. Klett presented his annual report. Robert T. Handy reported for the auditors that the accounts of the treasurer were found correct and the books in proper order. The treasurer's report was adopted as printed below.

It was announced that, as previously decided, the spring meeting will be held at Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind., on April 15-16, 1955.

The society voted that the next annual meeting shall be held in Washington, D. C., December 27-29, 1955.

The resignation of Raymond W. Albright as secretary of the society was accepted with regret. President Schneider was instructed to convey to Dr. Albright the society's sincere appreciation for his long and useful services as its secretary.

Wilhelm Pauck presented the report of the committee on nominations and the society elected the following persons to the respective offices and committees:

President, L. J. Trinterud
Vice-President, Quirinus Breen
Secretary, Winthrop Hudson
Assistant Secretary, Frederick W. Norwood
Treasurer, Guy S. Klett
Editors, James H. Nichols and L. J. Trinterud.

Other Voting Members of the Council: Massey H. Shepherd, Jr., Ray C. Petry, Sanford Fleming, Sidney E. Mead, Carl E. Schneider, George Williams, Robert T. Handy and H. Shelton Smith.

Editorial Board of *Church History*: James H. Nichols and L. J. Trinterud with the cooperation of Roland H.

Bainton, R. Pierce Beaver, Robert Grant, Winthrop S. Hudson, Sidney E. Mead, Wilhelm Pauck, Ray C. Petry and Matthew Spinka.

Membership Committee: Frederick Norwood, Chairman, Robert W. Goodloe, Harold Grimm, Lefferts Loetscher, Albert C. Outler, Matthew Spinka, Bard Thompson and John von Rohr.

Investment of Endowment Funds: Richard Cameron, Chairman, Carl E. Schneider and Guy S. Klett.

Research Committee: Edward R. Hardy, Chairman, Robert T. Handy, E. Harris Harbison and Niels Sonne.

Committee on Nominations: Matthew Spinka, Chairman, Jerald Brauer and Robert T. Handy.

Committee on Program and Local Arrangements for the Annual Meeting: Carl E. Schneider, Chairman, Ray C. Petry and Winthrop Hudson, *ex officio*.

Committee on Program and Local Arrangements for the Pacific Coast Meeting: Quirinus Breen, Chairman, John L. Anderson, Robert D. Clark, Sanford Fleming, Charles W. Hovland and John von Rohr.

The program at this meeting included the following papers: "Zwinglian Influence on the Elizabethan Settlement" by Melvyn Pratt, criticized by Cyril C. Richardson; "The Christian Communism of the Sixteenth Century Hutterites" by Robert M. Friedman, criticized by Roland H. Bainton; "Denominationalism as a Basis for Ecumenicity: A Seventeenth Century Conception" by Winthrop Hudson; "The Pacifism of the Sixteenth Century Anabaptists" by Harold S. Bender; "Concepts of Biography and History in American Puritanism" by Kenneth B. Murdock; "The Scottish Philosophy: Its Apologetical Role and Its Impact on Christian Thought in America" by Sydney E. Ahlstrom; and the presidential address, "The Americanization of August Rauschenbusch," by Carl E. Schneider.

Attest: Raymond W. Albright
Secretary.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER OF THE AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY

December 1, 1953 - November 30, 1954

I. CURRENT FUNDS

A. SUMMARY AND BALANCE

		Receipts	
Balance on hand, December 1, 1953			\$1,878.10
Membership dues		\$2,452.68	
Income from <i>Church History</i>		1,509.17	
<i>Studies</i>		113.58	
Special		217.50	
			4,292.93
Total Receipts			\$6,171.03
		Disbursements	
Expenses of management of Society		\$ 868.55	
Publication of <i>Church History</i>		2,645.39	
<i>Studies</i>		113.58	
Special		210.66	
Total Disbursements			\$3,838.18
Cash on hand, November 30, 1953, Fidelity-Philadelphia			
Trust Co. checking account, Bank Statement		\$3,350.65	
Less outstanding checks		1,017.80	
			\$2,332.85
			\$6,171.03

B. GENERAL FUNDS AND MAGAZINE

		Receipts	
Membership dues			
1952 - 2 members		\$ 8.00	
1953 - 69 members		275.55	
1954 - 542 members		2,154.38	
1955 - 6 members (3 only partial payment)		14.75	
			\$2,452.68
Subscriptions to <i>Church History</i>		\$1,262.65	
Sale of copies		111.52	
Advertising in <i>Church History</i>		135.00	
			1,509.17
			\$3,961.85

Disbursements

MANAGEMENT OF SOCIETY

Postage and express charges	\$ 109.80
Printing and mimeographing	112.75
Stationery and supplies	17.97
Secretarial services for Secretary, editors, treasurer	221.00
Safe Deposit box	6.00
Discount on Canadian checks	1.18
Expenses of Secretary	170.85
Bond of Treasurer	25.00
Treasurer's stipend	200.00
Refund and returned checks	4.00
	\$ 868.55

PUBLICATION OF CHURCH HISTORY

Printing and distribution of magazine	\$2,460.25
Postage and express charges	45.40
Stationery and supplies	3.40
Other Printing	18.00
Secretarial services	82.00
Refunds	19.95
Expenses of editors	16.39
	\$2,645.39

	\$3,513.94
Operating surplus	\$ 447.91

Guy S. Klett
Treasurer

MEMBERS OF THE SOCIETY

- Abel, Rev. Paul F., 964 Boston Post Rd., Rye, N. Y.
 Abram, Mr. H. Emerson, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
 Agnew, Mr. Theodore, 701 N. Bellis St., Stillwater, Okla.
 Ahlstrom, Dr. Sydney E., 220 Sterling Divinity Quadrangle, Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn.
 Albaugh, Rev. Gaylord P., McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Can.
 Albert, Prof. Frank J., Rt. No. 2, Noblesville, Ind.
 Albright, Prof. Raymond W., 101 Brattle St., Cambridge 38, Mass.
 Allbeck, Prof. Willard D., 19 E. Cecil St., Springfield, O.
 Allen, Rev. Henry, 504 Kelly St., Charles City, Iowa.
 Anderson, Rev. Charles A., 520 Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia 7, Penn.
 Anderson, Mr. Gerald H., 745 Commonwealth Ave., Boston 15, Mass.
 Anderson, Rev. Glenn P., 175 So. Main St., Attleboro, Mass.
 Anderson, Prof. John L., Lewis and Clark College, Portland, Ore.
 Anderson, Dr. O. V., 609 Brier St., Kenilworth, Ill.
 Arbaugh, Dean George B., 714 - 21st St., Rock Island, Ill.
 Ariga, Prof. Tetsutaro, Faculty of Letters, Kyoto Univ., Kyoto, Japan.
 Armstrong, Dr. Maurice W., Ursinus College, Collegeville, Penn.
 Aubrey, Prof. Edwin E., 708 Argyle Rd., Wynnewood, Penn.
 Aughbaugh, Rev. Olan W., 131 S. Seventh St., Coshocton, Ohio.
 Baar, Mr. William H., Brent House, 5540 Woodlawn Ave., Chicago 37, Ill.
 Baarman, Mr. Marvin C., 118 Liberty St., Lodi, N. J.
 Bachmann, Dr. E. Theodore, Pacific Lutheran Seminary, 2770 Marin Ave., Berkeley 8, Calif.
 Bainton, Prof. Roland H., 409 Prospect St., New Haven 11, Conn.
 Baker, Prof. Robert A., 1801 Boyce St., Fort Worth, Texas.
 Baker, Rev. William G., 12 Merchiston Park, Edinburgh, Scotland.
 Barbour, Rev. Hugh S., Wellesley College, Wellesley, Mass.
 Barkwell, Rev. Gordon E., Box 65, Chapleau, Ontario, Can.
 Barlow, Rev. L. L., Greenup, Ill.
 Barnes, Prof. William W., Box 6254 - Seminary Station, Fort Worth 15, Texas.
 Baron, Dr. Hans, 1032 N. State St., Chicago 10, Ill.
 Barry, Mr. Colman J., St. John's Abbey, Collegeville, Minn.
 Bassett, Mr. Thomas, Earlham College, Richmond, Ind.
 Battenhouse, Prof. Roy W., English Dept., Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
 Battles, Dr. Ford L., 98 Girard Ave., Hartford 5, Conn.
 Bauer, Prof. Walter E., 601 Indiana Ave., Valparaiso, Ind.
 Baxter, Prof. Norman A., Eastern Baptist College, 6355 Lancaster Ave., Philadelphia 31, Penn.
 Beal, Rev. William A., 4302-B Hartwick Rd., College Park, Md.
 Bean, Prof. Raymond J., Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Penn.
 Beardslee, Rev. John W., 814 Independence, Pella, Iowa.
 Beasley, Prof. Titus W., Box 367, Bolivar, Mo.
 Beaver, Rev. R. Pierce, 606 W. 122nd St., New York 27, N. Y.
 Beck, Prof. Henry G. J., Immaculate Conception Seminary, Ramsey, N. J.
 Bedikian, Rev. A. A., 164 Leonia Ave., Leonia, N. J.
 Behney, Prof. J. Bruce, United Theological Seminary, Dayton, Ohio.
 Bella, Rev. Julius I., 17 Route de Malagnou, Geneva, Switzerland.
 Bellamy, Miss Virginia N., Box 36, Lexington, Ky.
 Bender, Dean Harold S., Goshen College, Goshen, Ind.
 Benko, Dr. Stephen, 134 Norman Ave., Roebing, N. J.

- Bergendoff, President C. J. I., Augustana College, Rock Island, Ill.
 Berger, Rev. C. Edward, Box 349, Annapolis, Md.
 Beto, Rev. George J., Concordia College, Austin, Texas.
 Blackburn, Imri, 600 Haven St., Evanston, Ill.
 Blackman, Mr. George, 2 Philips Pl., Cambridge 38, Mass.
 Block, Mrs. Marguerite B., 401 Low Memorial Lib., Columbia University,
 New York 27, N. Y.
 Bouquet, Prof. Francis L., 124 Seminary Rd., San Anselmo, Calif.
 Bower, Rev. Kenneth I., 125 Logan St., Lewistown, Penn.
 Bratt, Prof. John H., 815 Alto St., S. E., Grand Rapids, Mich.
 Brauer, Prof. Jerald C., Swift Hall, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.
 Breakenridge, Mr. Melvin L., 2720 Centre St., No., Calgary, Alberta, Can.
 Bredemeier, Pres. Herbert G., 1 West Lane - Concordia College, Fort Wayne, Ind.
 Breen, Prof. Quirinus, Dept. of History, University of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.
 Bricker, Rev. George H., 338 College Ave., Lancaster, Penn.
 Brillr, Mr. Julius, 118 W. 73rd St., New York 23, N. Y.
 Brown, Mr. Earl K., 745 Commonwealth Ave., Boston 15, Mass.
 Brown, Dr. Ira V., Dept. of History, 114 Sparks Bldg., State College, Penn.
 Browne, Rev. Henry J., Caldwell Hall, Catholic University of America, Wash-
 ington 17, D. C.
 Bruins, Mr. Elton J., 17 E. Franklin St., Bound Brook, N. J.
 Brush, Prof. John W., 66 Oxford Rd., Newton Center, Mass.
 Bull, Mr. Robert J., P. O. 823, Colgate University, Hamilton, N. Y.
 Burkhart, Prof. B. LeRoy, Cedar Crest College, Allentown, Penn.
 Burr, Prof. Nelson R., 3130 Wisconsin Ave., N. W., - Apt. 708, Washington 16,
 D. C.
 Burtner, Mr. Robert W., 438 Maxwell Rd., Eugene, Ore.
 Byleen, Mr. Earl H., 9 Trinity Place, Montclair, N. J.
 Cabaniss, Prof. Allen, University, Mississippi.
 Cadbury, Prof. Henry J., Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Penn.
 Cadwallader, Mr. William, c/o Carl M. Capen, 79 Dejo Rd., Bangkok, Thailand.
 Caemmerer, Prof. Richard R., 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.
 Cairns, Prof. Earle E., 515 E. Prairie Ave., Wheaton, Ill.
 Calamandrei, Prof. Mauro, 100 W. 14th St., New York 11, N. Y.
 Calder, Miss Isabel M., 165 E. 60th St., New York 22, N. Y.
 Cameron, Mr. James, Garfield, 12 Victoria Sq., Stirling, Scotland.
 Cameron, Prof. Richard M., Boston University School of Theology, Boston, Mass.
 Campbell, Rev. James H., Box 52, Enless, Texas.
 Campbell, Dean Thomas H., Stonewall Extension, McKenzie, Tenn.
 Cannon, Prof. William R., Jr., Emory University, Ga.
 Caravetta, Mr. Paul D., 731 Ridge Ave., Pittsburgh 12, Penn.
 Carlson, Pres. Edgar M., Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.
 Carlson, Pres. Leland H., Rockford College, Rockford, Ill.
 Carlson, Rev. Martin E., 2445 Park Ave., Minneapolis 4, Minn.
 Carlsten, Rev. Alan W., Blauvelt, N. Y.
 Carpenter, Mr. Donald C., Williamsfield, Ill.
 Carpenter, Pres. Lewis B., 1540 Denver St., Kansas City 27, Mo.
 Carpenter, Dr. M. F., Box 579, Iowa City, Iowa.
 Carson, Prof. David M., Geneva College, Beaver Falls, Penn.
 Carter, Mr. Paul A., Box 34, Hampden, Me.
 Chandler, Prof. Douglas R., Westminster Theological Seminary, Westminster,
 Md.
 Chapman, Dr. Clayton H., RD. No. 1, Macungie, Penn.
 Charanis, Prof. Peter, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N. J.
 Chase, Dr. Daryl, Branch Agricultural College, Cedar City, Utah.
 Christian, Prof. James H., Bible Institute of Los Angeles, Box 337 - 558 S. Hope
 St., Los Angeles 17, Calif.

- Christie, Rev. John W., 2308 Madison St., Wilmington 259, Del.
Church, Prof. Frederic C., University of Idaho, Moscow, Idaho.
Clark, Prof. Robert D., 2323 University St., Eugene, Ore.
Clebsch, Rev. William A., Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va.
Clemmer, Prof. Robert R., 121 Glenwood Ave., Meadville, Penn.
Clifford, Rev. J. Ayson, 63 Victoria Ave., Auckland, S. E., 2, New Zealand.
Coates, Rev. Thomas, Concordia College, 2811 N. E. Holman St., Portland 11, Ore.
Coombs, Mr. Richard P., Box 696, Salinas, Calif.
Core, Prof. Arthur C., 1947 Elsmere Ave., Dayton 6, Ohio.
Correll, Prof. Ernst, American University School of Social Sciences and Public Affairs, 1901 F. St., N. W., Washington 6, D. C.
Cory, Rev. David M., 83 - 73rd St., Brooklyn 19, N. Y.
Cousland, Prof. Kenneth H., Emmanuel College, Toronto, Can.
Crompton, Rev. Arnold, 685 - 14th St., Oakland 12, Calif.
Cross, Mr. William M., 7036 S. Kimbark Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Crouse, Prof. Moses C., 177 Calumet Ave., Aurora, Ill.
Crouse, Prof. R. D., Trinity College, Toronto 5, Canada.
Crownfield, Prof. Frederic R., Guilford College, Guilford, N. C.
Crummey, Rev. D. Clifford, 1625 No. Lincoln St., Stockton 4, Calif.
Crusius, Prof. Paul N., Elmhurst College, Elmhurst, Ill.
Cushman, Prof. Robert E., Duke University Divinity School, Durham, N. C.
Cypris, Mr. Ottomar F., 99 Claremont Ave., New York 27, N. Y.
Dahmus, Prof. Joseph H., Pleasant Gap, Penn.
Daniel, Rev. John, 1240 E. 4th St., Bethlehem, Penn.
Daroczy, Rev. Alexander, 175 Pershing Ave., Carteret, N. J.
Davis, Rev. Donald G., 170 So. Virgil Ave., Los Angeles 4, Calif.
Dawley, Prof. Powell M., 8 Chelsea Square, New York 11, N. Y.
Deale, Mr. Alan G., Manchester College, Oxford, England.
Deems, Prof. Mervin M., Bangor Theol. Seminary, Bangor, Me.
DeGroot, Prof. Alfred T., Dean of Graduate School, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Texas.
Deitz, Mr. Reginald W., Lutheran Seminary, Gettysburg, Penn.
Delp, Mr. George, Eastern Nazarene College, Wollaston, Mass.
Derby, Mr. Howard W., 119 Jules Ave., San Francisco 12, Calif.
Dettrey, Rev. Richard E., 23 Manor Rd., Paoli, Penn.
Dillenberger, Prof. John, Harvard Divinity School, Andover Hall - Francis Ave., Cambridge 38, Mass.
Donovan, Rev. Paul R., Jr., 1142 - 17th Ave. No., Seattle 2, Washington.
Drury, Prof. Clifford M., 118 Bolinas Ave., San Anselmo, Calif.
Duncan, Prof. Pope A., Southeastern Baptist Theological Sem., Wake Forest, N. C.
Dunn, Prof. David, 519 Pine St., Lancaster, Pa.
Eadie, Mr. Douglas G., University of Redlands, Redlands, Calif.
Eaheart, Chaplain Karl F., Jr., 221 Searight Dr., Fort Bragg, N. C.
Eenigenburg, Rev. Elton M., 18 Cherry St., Holland, Mich.
Egigian, Mr. Robert, 316 Acacia St., Altadena, Calif.
Eisenach, Prof. George, Yankton College, Yankton, South Dakota.
Eklund, Emmet, Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kan.
Eller, Prof. Paul H., Evangelical Theological Seminary, Naperville, Ill.
Elliott, Prof. Willis E., Community Church, Morton, Ill.
Ellis, Prof. Ivan C., John Brown University, Siloam Springs, Ark.
Eminhizer, Prof. Earl E., Crozer Seminary, Chester, Pa.
Emmons, Rev. Irvin W., 816 E. Church St., Marion, O.
Emrich, Rev. Stanley E., 119 Leigh St., South Boston, Va.
Engelbrecht, Mr. Robert, Moravian Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Penn.
Erb, Mrs. Alta, Mennonite Publishing House, Scottsdale, Penn.
Erickson, Mr. Carl I., Central Bible Institute, Springfield, Mo.

- Estep, Prof. William R., Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Seminary Hill, Fort Worth, Tex.
- Fagley, Rev. Frederick L., 60 Gramercy Park, New York 10, N. Y.
- Fairweather, Rev. Eugene R., Trinity College, Toronto 5, Ontario, Can.
- Farris, Prof. Allan L., Knox College, 59 St. George St., Toronto 5, Ontario, Can.
- Farris, Mr. Donn M., 1018 Buchanan Blvd., Durham, N. C.
- Fevold, Prof. E. L., 1422 - 5th St., S., Moorhead, Minn.
- Fink, Mr. W. Jeryl, 4698 S. 36th St., Arlington, Va.
- Fischer, Prof. Peter B., 328 Morrill Hall, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich.
- Fischer, Rev. Robert H., 1644 S. 11th Ave., Maywood, Ill.
- Fisher, Rev. Miles M., 1219 Fayetteville St., Durham, N. C.
- Fleming, Pres. Sanford, Berkeley Baptist Divinity School, 2606 Dwight Way, Berkeley, Calif.
- Florovsky, Prof. George, 537 W. 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.
- Ford, Mr. Howard B., Jr., 4 Greeley St., Hudson, N. H.
- Forell, Prof. George W., 213 Riverview, Iowa City, Iowa.
- Forman, Prof. Charles C., Divinity Hall 21, Cambridge 38, Mass.
- Fortenbaugh, Prof. Robert, Gettysburg College, Gettysburg, Penn.
- Fortney, Prof. Edward L., Drew University, Madison, N. J.
- Franz, Prof. Leonard J., Dept. of History, Tabor College, Hillsboro, Kans.
- Friedli, Mr. Josias, Mission House, Wautoma, Wisc.
- Friedman, Prof. Robert M., Western Michigan College, Kalamazoo 45D, Mich.
- Froom, Rev. LeRoy E., The Ministry, Takoma Park, Washington 12, D. C.
- Frye, Prof. Roland M., Emory University, Emory University, Ga.
- Fuller, Rev. Robert D., 306 N. Main St., Owensville, Ind.
- Gabel, Prof. Leona C., 26 Maynard Rd., Northampton, Mass.
- Gaddis, Prof. Merrill E., 400 N. Church St., Fayette, Mo.
- Gallos, Rev. George P., 22 - 24 W. Preston St., Baltimore, Md.
- Galloway, Mr. Bruce C., 314 Marquette Dr., San Antonio 1, Tex.
- Gamer, Prof. Carl W., 611 North B. St., Monmouth, Ill.
- Garber, Bishop Paul N., 404 Methodist Bldg., Richmond, Va.
- Garrett, Prof. James L., 1415 W. Boyce Ave., Forth Worth 15, Tex.
- Garrison, Prof. Winfred E., Box 343 - University of Houston, Houston 4, Tex.
- Gaustad, Prof. Edwin S., Shorter College, Rome, Ga.
- Gieseler, Prof. Carl A., Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.
- Gilbert, Prof. William, Dept. of History, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
- Giltner, Mr. John H., 1 Colonial Blvd., West Haven 16, Conn.
- Gingerich, Prof. Melvin, 405 Marilyn, Goshen, Ind.
- Gittings, Mr. Leonard, 3040 W. Washington Blvd., Chicago 12, Ill.
- Glick, Mr. G. Wayne, 16 N. Pine St., Lancaster, Penn.
- Glimm, Rev. Francis X., Immaculate Conception Seminary, Huntington, N. Y.
- Gockel, Rev. Julius H., Box 35 - 405 Prairie Ave., Wilmette, Ill.
- Goerner, Rev. Walter J., Box 90, Harper, Tex.
- Gonder, Dr. Harold A., Ursuline College, 2234 Overlook Rd., Cleveland 6, O.
- Goodloe, Prof. Robert W., School of Theology, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Tex.
- Goodwin, Mr. Wendell, Box 1081, Chicago 90, Ill.
- Gordon, Rev. Ernest, Westminster House, 11 Mercer St., Princeton, N. J.
- Gorrell, Mr. Donald K., 102 Gilbert Ave., New Haven, Conn.
- Grant, Rev. Robert M., 5728 Harper Ave., Chicago 37, Ill.
- Gratz, Mr. D. L., Route No. 2, Box 155, Bluffton, O.
- Grayzel, Rabbi Solomon, Jewish Publication Society, 222 No. 15th St., Philadelphia 2, Penn.
- Greeley, Mr. Arthur W., 161 Church St., Oakland, Me.
- Greene, Mr. John G., 6 Chestnut St., Boston 8, Mass.
- Greenlow, Prof. Ralph, 105 Concord, Needham Heights, Mass.

- Gregori, Rev. Joseph, 304 E. Twentieth St., S., Newton, Iowa.
Griffith, Dr. Ross J., North West Christian College, 828 E. 11th Ave., Eugene, Ore.
Grimm, Prof. Harold J., Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.
Hall, Dean Colby, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.
Hall, Prof. George F., c/o National Lutheran Council, 50 Madison Ave., New York 10, N. Y.
Hall, Mr. Kenneth F., 916 Myers Ave., Anderson, Ind.
Haller, Prof. William, Folger Shakespeare Library, Washington 3, D. C.
Hamilton, Dr. Harold P., North Carolina State College, Box 5276 State College Station, Raleigh, N. C.
Hamilton, Bishop Kenneth G., 49 Church St., Bethlehem, Penn.
Handy, Prof. Robert T., Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.
Harbison, Prof. E. Harris, Dept. of History, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.
Hardy, Prof. Edward R., Jr., 46 Mansfield St., New Haven 11, Conn.
Harland, Rev. Harry G., 705 Fleet Ave., Winnipeg, Manitoba, Can.
Harris, Mr. Carl V., 205 Bouchelle St., Morganton, N. C.
Harrison, Prof. Irvine J., Southern California Bible College, Costa Mesa, Calif.
Hartley, Mr. Charles E., 1401 Florida Ave., St. Cloud, Fla.
Hartwig, Prof. George H., 3314 S. Emerson Ave., Minneapolis 8, Minn.
Hasson, Mr. Alan, 600 W. 122nd St., New York 27, N. Y.
Hategan, Rev. Vasile, 50 W. 89th St., New York 24, N. Y.
Haussler, Prof. J. Cecil, La Sierra College, Arlington, Calif.
Hawkins, Prof. E. M., Cotner College, 1237 R St., Lincoln 8, Nebr.
Hawkinson, Prof. Eric G., 5223 N. Christiana Ave., Chicago 25, Ill.
Hawley, Prof. Charles A., Ottawa University, Ottawa, Kans.
Hays, Prof. Arthur A., 154 S. Wade Ave., Washington, Penn.
Hays, Dr. Conard, Harding College, Searcy, Ark.
Heim, Prof. Kenneth E., 19 Akashi Cho, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.
Henderson, Rev. Robert W., Box 34, East Derry, N. H.
Henkel, Mrs. Milford F., II, Sewickley Baptist Church, Sewickley, Penn.
Henkel, Rev. Milford F., II, Sewickley Baptist Church, Sewickley, Penn.
Henry, Dr. C. F. H., Fuller Theological Seminary, Pasadena, Calif.
Heron, Mr. Laurence T., 18520 Stewart Ave., Homewood, Ill.
Hiemstra, Rev. William L., 638 Goffle Hill Rd., Hawthorne, N. J.
Hightower, Prof. Raymond L., Kalamazoo College, Kalamazoo, Mich.
Hine, Mr. Leland D., 3100 W. Washington Ave., Chicago 12, Ill.
Hobart, Prof. Kenneth, 2835 Hillegass Ave., Berkeley 5, Calif.
Hoffman, Prof. Milton J., New Brunswick Theological Seminary, New Brunswick, N. J.
Hogue, Prof. Harland E., 618 Santa Barbara Rd., Berkeley, Calif.
Holborn, Prof. Hajo, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.
Holm, Rev. Bernard J., Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa.
Holmes, Dr. John H. A., King's College, Halifax, Nova Scotia.
Holmes, Mr. Kenneth L., 1220 Melrose Ave., McMinnville, Ore.
Holter, Prof. Don W., Garrett Biblical Seminary, Evanston, Ill.
Holtzheimer, Rev. Robert, 1216 Main St., Iowa Falls, Iowa.
Hommes, Mr. Tjaard Georg, Fryeburg, Me.
Honigsheim, Prof. Paul, 802 Cherry Lane - Ap. 112, East Lansing, Mich.
Hoover, Mr. Charles E., 439 Greene St., Augusta, Ga.
Hope, Prof. Norman V., 98 Mercer St., Princeton, N. J.
Hopkins, Prof. C. Howard, Stetson University, DeLand, Fla.
Hough, Rev. Lynn H., 1165 Fifth Ave., New York 29, N. Y.
Howell, Mr. David H., 4 Southampton Ave., E., Hampton, Va.
Hoy, Dr. W. Ivan, Dept. of Religion, University of Miami, Box 742, Coral Gables 46, Fla.
Hoyer, Prof. Theo., 801 DeMun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.

- Hudson, Prof. Winthrop S., 1100 S. Goodman St., Rochester 7, N. Y.
 Hughes, Rev. Dr. E. M., St. Peter's College, Cross Roads, Jamaica, B. W. I.
 Hunter, Mr. Allan J., Rt. No. 4, Box 106, Noblesville, Ind.
 Hutton, Rev. J. Louis, 78 East Main St., Gowanda, N. Y.
 Ingram, Prof. William T., Jr., 230 Georgia Ave., McKenzie, Tenn.
 Inoue, Prof. Chiyu, Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan.
 Irby, Prof. Joe B., 821 Bethel Ct., McKenzie, Tenn.
 Irwin, Prof. W. A., Perkins School of Theology, Dallas 5, Tex.
 Istavridis, Rev. Vasil T., 105 Birinci cadde, Arnavutkoy, Istanbul, Turkey.
 Jackson, Prof. Herbert C., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2825 Lexington Rd., Louisville 6, Ky.
 Jamison, Rev. Wallace N., 239 Mercer St., New Wilmington, Penn.
 Jones, Dr. B. Franklin, 916 Kagawa St., New Wilmington, Penn.
 Jansen, Rev. H. M., Jr., 175 Ninth Ave., New York, 11, N. Y.
 Johansen, Rev. John H., 904 W. Academy St., Winston-Salem 7, N. C.
 Johansmann, Rev. Urban F., 838 Alhambra Court, Park Hills, Covington, Ky.
 Johnson, Dr. F. Ernest, 297 Fourth Ave., New York 10, N. Y.
 Johnson, Prof. Roy H., Thiel College, Greenville, Penn.
 Johnston, Rev. Charles F., St. Stephen's College, Edmonton, Alta., Can.
 Johnston, Prof. George, Emmanuel College, Toronto, Ontario, Can.
 Jones, Mr. Archie B., Dept. of History, Hastings College, Hastings, Neb.
 Jones, Rev. Marc E., Rt. 1, E. Stanwood, Wash.
 Jones, Prof. Myrddyn W., School of Religion Library, Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.
 Kahler, Mr. A. R., Jr., Dean St., West Mansfield, O.
 Kalfayan, Rev. Puzant H., 475 Bluff Rd., Palisades, N. J.
 Keith, Prof. Noel L., Brite College of the Bible, Texas Christian University, Fort Worth, Tex.
 Kegley, Prof. Charles W., Dept. of Philosophy, Wagner College, Staten Island 1, N. Y.
 Kelley, Chaplain Orris E., 929 Merrill St., Salina, Kans.
 Kerr, Prof. William F., Box 1706, c/o Conservative Baptist Church, Salinas, Cal.
 Kerr, Prof. William N., 50 Craiglea Dr., Edinburgh, Scotland.
 Kieffer, Mr. Jay, Box 2311 D., Pasadena 2, Calif.
 Kiessling, Prof. Elmer C., 501 College Ave., Watertown, Wis.
 Kimber, Prof. H. H., Director of the Division of Social Science, Michigan State College, East Lansing, Mich.
 Kimble, Rev. Melvin A., 64 W. Main St., Chillicothe, O.
 King, Prof. George B., 539 Douglas Ave., Toronto 12, Ontario, Can.
 Kingdon, Mr. Robert M., Dept. of History, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.
 Klett, Mr. Guy S., 231 So. 44th St., Philadelphia 4, Penn.
 Knappen, Prof. M. M., Dept. of Political Science, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
 Knight, Rev. Lewis J., Box 676, Friona, Tex.
 Knox, Prof. John, Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.
 Knudsen, Pres. Johannes, 1114 S. 3rd Ave., Maywood, Ill.
 Knudsen, Prof. Ralph E., 2606 Dwight Way, Berkeley 4, Calif.
 Koenker, Rev. Ernest B., 361 McIntyre Court, Valparaiso, Ind.
 Kohler, Rev. Paul W., 918 Texas St., Louisville 4, Ky.
 Korn, Dr. Bertram W., 332 Rice's Mill Rd., Wyncote, Penn.
 Krahn, Prof. Cornelius, Bethel College, North Newton, Kans.
 Kraus, Prof. C. Norman, Goshen College, Goshen, Ind.
 Kreider, Mr. Robert, R.R. No. 2, Bluffton, O.
 Kretzmann, Pres. Otto P., Valparaiso University, Valparaiso, Ind.
 Kristeller, Dr. Paul O., 1161 Amsterdam Ave., New York 27, N. Y.

- Kromminga, Rev. John H., 1547 Sherman St., S. E., Grand Rapids 6, Mich.
 Krug, Rev. Charles D., 180 Tunstead Ave., San Anselmo, Calif.
 Kuhns, Rev. Frederick I., P. O. Box 292, Billings, Mont.
 Kuntz, Prof. Paul G., 1321 Main St., Grinnell, Iowa.
 Laantee, Mr. Karl, 7301 Germantown, Ave., Philadelphia 19, Penn.
 Lambert, Rev. Byron C., 8311 S. Paxton Ave., Chicago 17, Ill.
 Lammert, Rev. Fred R., 159 E. Wood Ave., Raymondville, Tex.
 Landeen, Prof. William M., 435 Todd Hall - State College, Pullman, Wash.
 Lang, Rev. N. Frederick, 198 Mitchel Ave., East Meadow, L. I., N. Y.
 Langford, Rev. Norman F., 1100 Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia 7, Penn.
 Langtry, Rev. Walter D., Prytania St. Presbyterian Church, Prytania & Josephine
 Sts., New Orleans, La.
 Larson, Prof. Ernest S., Wheaton College, Wheaton, Ill.
 Latourette, Prof. Kenneth S., Yale Divinity School, New Haven 11, Conn.
 LeCompte, Mr. Milton F., 464 S. 2nd St., Millville, N. J.
 Ledbetter, Dr. Robert E., Jr., 2433 Guadalupe, Austin 5, Tex.
 Lenz, Rev. Albert W., Presbyterian Manse, Germantown, Md.
 Levy, Dr. Babette M., 315 E. 68th St., New York 21, N. Y.
 Lewis, Mr. J. Stanley, 3112 Ozark Circle, N. W., North Chattanooga, Tenn.
 Linden, Rev. Earl E. G., 174 Armington St., Providence 5, R. I.
 Lindsell, Prof. Harold, 135 N. Oakland, Pasadena 1, Calif.
 Littell, Dr. F. H., Uhlendstrasse 11, Bad Godesburg, am Rhein, Germany.
 Loetscher, Prof. F. W., 24 Armour Rd., Princeton, N. J.
 Loetscher, Prof. Lefferts A., 43 Hibben Rd., Princeton, N. J.
 Ludlow, Prof. William L., Muskingum College, New Concord, O.
 Lumpkin, Prof. William L., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.
 Lund, Rev. Gene, Elbow Lake, Minn.
 Lunsford, Prof. R. L., Olivet Nazarene College 57, Kankakee, Ill.
 McAllister, Mr. Lester G., 2401 LeConte Ave., Berkeley 9, Calif.
 McAvoy, Rev. Thomas T., University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Ind.
 McCabe, Rev. Martin J., Box 105, Ponce, Puerto Rico.
 McCallum, Mr. Malcolm, 2001 A Lester St., Bakersfield, Calif.
 McGee, Rev. Harold, 320 E. College St., Iowa City, Iowa.
 McGiffert, Pres. Arthur C., 5757 University Ave., Chicago 37, Ill.
 McGiffert, Mr. Michael, Box 656 - Colgate Station, Hamilton, N. Y.
 McGrew, Mr. William E., Lutheran Children's Home, Zelenople, Penn.
 McKee, Pres. Dean G., 235 E. 49th St., New York 17, N. Y.
 McKinney, Rev. William W., 823 Maplewood Ave., Ambridge, Penn.
 McNeill, Rev. Frederic, 200 E. Washington, Mount Pleasant, Iowa.
 McNeill, Prof. John T., Elmsdale, East Middlebury, Vt.
 Mackie, Rev. Alexander, Garden Court Plaza - Apt. 4H, Pine St. at 47th St.,
 Philadelphia 43, Penn.
 Maclear, Rev. James F., 825 Wesley Ave., Oak Park, Ill.
 MacNair, Dr. A. Stanley, 4554 - 12th Ave., N. E., Seattle, Wash.
 MacVicar, Rev. Donald H., 269 Arlington Ave., Brooklyn 8, N. Y.
 Manross, Rev. William W., 221 Kathmere Rd., Havertown, Penn.
 Manschreck, Mr. Clyde L., Box 4735, Duke Univ., Durham, N. C.
 Maring, Prof. Norman H., Eastern Baptist Seminary, Lancaster Ave. & City Line,
 Philadelphia 31, Penn.
 Mattox, Dean F. W., Harding College, Searcy, Ark.
 Maurer, Rev. Kenneth R., Evangelical Congregational School of Theology, My-
 erstown, Penn.
 May, Mr. James W., Box 1028, Emory University, Ga.
 Meacham, Dr. Paul, 920 Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia 7, Penn.
 Mead, Prof. Sidney E., Faculty Exchange, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill.
 Means, Dr. Paul B., Literacy House 1, Bund Rd., Allahabad 2, India.
 McKeel, Rev. Herbert S., 209 Union St., Schenectady 5, N. Y.

- Messenger, Prof. Ruth E., 720 West End Ave., New York 25, N. Y.
 Meuser, Prof. Fred W., Lutheran Theological Seminary, Columbus 9, O.
 Meyer, Pres. Carl S., 6317 Southwood Ave. - Apt. 3-W, Clayton 5, Mo.
 Meyer, Rev. Jacob B., 98 William St., Orange, N. J.
 Michaelides, Rev. George S., Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin, O.
 Michaelsen, Prof. Robert S., School of Religion, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
 Miller, Mr. Dale, Dept. of Religion, Drake Univ., Des Moines, Iowa.
 Miller, Rev. John A., Route 1, New Bethlehem, Pa.
 Miller, Prof. Perry, Widener 16, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 Million, Mr. Elmer G., 2400 Sedgwick Ave. - Apt. 5C, New York 68, N. Y.
 Mills, Mr. Charles, Lincoln Bible Institute, Lincoln, Ill.
 Mills, Mr. Hubert F., 1807 Brazos - Apt. 21, Austin 1, Texas.
 Mitchell, Rev. Charles B., Fredericksburg, Ohio.
 Moehlman, Prof. Conrad H., School of Religion, University of Southern California, 3519 University Ave., Los Angeles 7, Calif.
 Moore, Pres. Dale H., Cedar Crest College, Allentown, Penn.
 Moose, Prof. John B., Box 457, Leesville, S. C.
 Morris, Mr. Raymond P., 409 Prospect St., New Haven 11, Conn.
 Morris, Rev. William S., 5550 S. Blackstone Ave., Chicago 37, Ill.
 Moseley, Rev. J. Edward, 5155 Atherton So. Dr. Indianapolis 19, Ind.
 Mosse, Dr. George L., Dept. of History, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
 Mosteller, Dr. James D., 3040 W. Washington Blvd., Chicago 12, Ill.
 Mott, Dr. John R., Y. M. C. A. Rm. 704, 291 Broadway, New York, N. Y.
 Moudy, Prof. James M., Atlantic Christian College, Wilson, N. C.
 Mueller, Prof. William A., 327 S. Birchwood, Louisville 6, Ky.
 Mullett, Prof. Charles F., University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
 Mundinger, Pres. Carl S., St. John's College, Winfield, Kans.
 Murphy, Mr. Robert M., 43 Acosta Ave., Elm Grove, W. Va.
 Murray, Rev. Andrew E., Lincoln University, Lincoln University, Penn.
 Neal, Prof. Fred, Box 148, State College, Miss.
 Neiwith, Rev. M. Jerry, Baiting Hollow-Wading River, Calverton, N. Y.
 Nelson, Prof. Benjamin N., 725 - 7th St., S. E., Minneapolis 14, Minn.
 Nelson, Prof. E. Clifford, Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.
 Nelson, Clyde K., 6411 Malvern Ave., Philadelphia 31, Pa.
 Nemser, Mr. Rudolph, Littleton Rd., Harvard, Mass.
 Neth, Rev. John W., Jr., Milligan College, Point Breeze, Tenn.
 Newcombe, Prof. Alfred W., Knox College, Galesburg, Ill.
 Newport, Prof. John P., Seminary Hill Station, Fort Worth 15, Texas.
 Nichol, Mr. Francis D., Review and Herald, Takoma Park, Washington 12, D. C.
 Nichols, Prof. James H., 5745 Harper Ave., Chicago 37, Ill.
 Nichols, Robert Hastings, 21 Claremont Ave., New York 27, N. Y.
 Nielsen, Rev. Ernest D., 2823 E. Ninth St., Des Moines 16, Iowa.
 Nikoloff, Rev. Nicholas, 621 Williams St., Springfield, Mo.
 Nixon, Rev. Leroy, 138-11 58 Rd., Flushing 55, N. Y.
 Nolan, Prof. Hugh J., Immaculata College, Immaculata, Pa.
 Norwood, Prof. Frederick A., 826 Park Ave., Wilmette, Ill.
 Norwood, Prof. Percy V., 634 Sherman Ave., Evanston, Ill.
 Nyholm, Prof. Paul C. E., Blair, Nebr.
 Oberholzer, Mr. Emil, Jr., 1112 Park Ave., New York 28, N. Y.
 Ockoljich, Rev. Firmilian, St. Sava Monastery, Libertyville, Ill.
 Oliphant, Prof. J. Orin, College Park, Lewisburg, Penn.
 Olmstead, Dr. Clifton E., 7210 Maple Ave., Takoma 12, Md.
 Olsen, Prof. Olaf Severn, Alderson-Broadbudd College, Philippi, W. Va.
 Olson, Dr. John F., 102 Kensington Rd., Syracuse 10, N. Y.
 Olson, Rev. Virgil A., 1526 N. Snelling Ave., St. Paul E-4, Minn.
 O'Malley, Prof. Charles, Dept. of History, Stanford University, Calif.

- Orr, Rev. Owen R., Trinity College, Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada.
Osborn, Prof. Ronald E., School of Religion, Butler University, Indianapolis, Ind.
Outler, Prof. Albert C., Southern Methodist University, Dallas 5, Tex.
Pannabecker, Pres. S. F., 4642 Woodlawn Ave., Chicago 15, Ill.
Parrott, Mr. Douglas M., 76 Main St., Cold Spring, Putnam Co., N. Y.
Patterson, Prof. Lloyd G., General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Sq., New York 11, N. Y.
Pauck, Prof. Wilhelm, Union Theological Seminary, Broadway at 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.
Peachey, Mr. Paul, Eastern Mennonite College, Harrisonburg, Va.
Peake, Rev. F. A., The Anglican Theological College of British Columbia, 6050 Chancellor Blvd., Vancouver 8, B. C., Can.
Pelikan, Prof. Jaroslav J., Jr., University of Chicago Divinity School, Chicago 37, Ill.
Penny, Rev. Wilfred F., 11th & Lincoln Ave., Prospect Park, Pa.
Persons, Mr. Stow, 209 Schaeffer Hall, State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa.
Peterson, Rev. Orval D., First Christian Church, Box 31, Yakima, Wash.
Peterson, Rev. Vivan A., St. James Church, 2814 E. Overlook, Cleveland, O.
Petherick, Mrs. Florence, 8 Garrison St., Boston 16, Mass.
Petry, Prof. Ray C., 128 Pinecrest Rd., Durham, N. C.
Pherigo, Prof. Lindsay P., Scarritt College, Nashville, Tenn.
Piepkorn, Mr. Arthur C., 801 De Mun St., St. Louis 5, Mo.
Pierce, Rev. Richard D., 37 Beacon St., Boston 8, Mass.
Piper, Prof. Otto A., 58 Mercer St., Princeton, N. J.
Plummer, Rev. Kenneth M., Box 162, Lake Villa, Ill.
Poettcker, Mr. Henry, R. D. No. 1, Pennington, N. J.
Pollard, Prof. James H., Linfield College, McMinnville, Ore.
Porter, Rev. H. Boone, Jr., Nashotah House, Nashotah, Wis.
Porteus, Rev. Chester A., 17 Elm St., Quincy 69, Mass.
Pratt, Rev. Cuthbert, 1414 N. Dearborn Parkway, Chicago 10, Ill.
Pratt, Rev. Melvyn E., Jr., 934 Ramona St., Palo Alto, Calif.
Price, Prof. Theron D., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville 6, Ky.
Purdy, Prof. Judson, Trinity College, Toronto 5, Canada.
Rafos, Prof. Otto T., 8023 S. Artesian Ave., Chicago 29, Ill.
Ramstad, Rev. Philip J., 1028 Chartiers Ave., Pittsburgh 20, Penn.
Rand, Prof. Sidney A., Forest City, Iowa.
Randolph, Dr. Corliss F., 83 Jefferson Ave., Maplewood, N. J.
Rankin, Rev. Walton W., 518 Witherspoon Bldg., Philadelphia 7, Penn.
Ransom, Prof. Guy H., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville 6, Ky.
Raymond, Prof. Irving W., 400 W. 118th St., New York 27, N. Y.
Reed, Prof. H. Clay, 157 W. Main St., Newark, Del.
Rehwinkel, Prof. A. M., Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.
Reid, Rev. James B., 201 S. 21st St., Philadelphia 3, Penn.
Remington, Mr. Jesse A., 332 Laurel Ave., Laurel, Md.
Renfer, Prof. Rudolf A., 3909 Swiss Ave., Dallas, Tex.
Requardt, Mr. Edward J., 117 Spring St., Willimantic, Conn.
Reynolds, Mr. Levering, Jr., 61 Shawsheen Rd., Andover, Mass.
Reynolds, Rev. Ralph W., 27 Oakland St., Medford 55, Mass.
Richardson, Dr. Cyril C., 99 Claremont Ave., New York 27, N. Y.
Rigg, Prof. Horace A., Jr., 16390 S. Park Blvd., Cleveland 20, O.
Riley, Very Rev. Msgr. Arthur J., Our Lady of Good Counsel Rectory, 126 Sea St., Quincy 69, Mass.
Rist, Prof. Martin, Office of Librarian, Iliff School of Theology, Denver 9, Colo.
Ritz, Rev. O. J., 54 Hillcrest Ave., Hamden, Conn.
Robinson, Rev. Jack Fay, 7821 W. 66th St., Argo, Ill.
Robinson, Prof. William C., 511 Columbia Dr., Decatur, Ga.
Rockwell, Mrs. Katharine L. R., 39 Claremont Ave., New York 27, N. Y.

- Rockwell, Rev. William W., 39 Claremont Ave., New York 27, N. Y.
 Roddy, Mr. Clarence S., 2241 Brigden Rd., Pasadena, Calif.
 Roddy, Prof. Serman, Conservative Baptist Seminary, 1500 E. Tenth Ave., Denver 18, Colo.
 Roeger, Rev. William C., Park Ave., Chalfont, Penn.
 Rogers, Prof. Elizabeth F., Wilson College, Chambersburg, Penn.
 Rood, Prof. Wayne R., 1798 Scenic Ave., Berkeley 9, Calif.
 Ross, Prof. James B., Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.
 Ross, Mr. Robert W., 207 N. 58th St., Seattle 7, Wash.
 Roth, Prof. Paul H., Northwestern Lutheran Theological Seminary, Minneapolis, Minn.
 Rudolph, Mr. L. C., 109 E. Broadway, Louisville 2, Ky.
 Rushdoony, Rev. Rousas J., 325 Berkeley Way, Santa Cruz, Calif.
 Ryan, Prof. Edward A., Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.
 St. Amant, Prof. C. Penrose, 909 Ursulines, New Orleans 16, La.
 Sanders, Rev. Paul S., The Cottage - Arnold Rd., Amherst, Mass.
 Schackenberg, Dr. Walter C., Jr., Pacific Lutheran College, Parkland, Wash.
 Schafer, Prof. Thomas A., Box 4634 - Duke Sta., Durham, N. C.
 Schmemmann, Rev. Alexander, 537 W. 121st St., New York 27, N. Y.
 Schneider, Dr. Carl E., 129 Bonipart Ave., Webster Groves, Mo.
 Schoenfuhs, Rev. Walter P., 32 W. Seminary Ter., Clayton 5, Mo.
 Schwab, Prof. Paul J., Trinity University, San Antonio, Tex.
 Schwiebert, Prof. Ernest G., Bonnie Branch Rd., Ellicott City, Md.
 Scott, Rev. Crawford, c/o M. I. Pattee, 42 Port St. E., Port Credit, Ontario, Can.
 Senior, Rev. Robert C., Prospect Green, R. 2, Waterbury 12, Conn.
 Shepherd, Prof. Massey H., Jr., 624 Euclid Ave., Berkeley, Calif.
 Shimun, Mar Eshai, His Grace the Patriarch of the East, 6346 N. Sheridan Rd., Chicago 40, Ill.
 Shipley, Prof. David C., Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.
 Shippy, Rev. Howard F., 210 E. Morrison St., Wilmore, Ky.
 Shires, Prof. Henry M., 4 St. John's Rd., Cambridge 38, Mass.
 Shoemaker, Prof. George C., N. W. Christian College, Eugene, Ore.
 Short, Prof. Howard E., College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.
 Siegenthaler, Mr. David, 82 W. Cedar St., Boston 14, Mass.
 Silbert, Rev. William G., 143 Main St., Phoenixville, Penn.
 Simkins, Rev. Cyril C., P. O. Box 312, Rogersville, Tenn.
 Simpson, Rev. Ervin P., 209 Ramona Ave., El Cerrito, Calif.
 Slosser, Prof. Gaius J., 203 Summit Ave. - Bellevue, Pittsburgh 2, Penn.
 Smith, Miss A. Marguerite, Zion Research Lib., 120 Seaver St., Brookline 46, Mass.
 Smith, Dean Elwyn A., Theological Seminary of Dubuque, Dubuque, Iowa.
 Smith, Prof. H. Shelton, 2721 Dogwood Rd., Durham, N. C.
 Smith, Prof. John W. V., School of Theology, Anderson, Ind.
 Smith, Rev. Lyndon, Trinity College, Toronto 5, Ontario, Canada.
 Smith, Prof. Timothy L., Eastern Nazarene College, Wollaston, Mass.
 Smith, Rev. Waldo E. L., Queen's Theological College, Kingston, Ontario, Can.
 Smith, Rev. W. Thomas, Young Harris College, Young Harris, Ga.
 Smucker, Prof. Donovan E., 3435 W. Van Buren, Chicago 24, Ill.
 Snuggs, Prof. R. Grady, 1748 S. Knoxville, Tulsa 12, Okla.
 Solt, Mr. Lee F., Dept. of History, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.
 Sonnack, Rev. Paul G., Augsburg College and Seminary, Minneapolis 4, Minn.
 Sonne, Dr. Niels H., 175 Ninth Ave., New York 11, N. Y.
 Speel, Rev. Charles J., II, Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill.
 Spellman, Mr. Normann, Box 161 - 409 Prospect St., New Haven 11, Conn.
 Spinka, Prof. Matthew, 92 Sherman St., Hartford, Conn.
 Starr, Mr. Edward C., Crozer Seminary Library, Chester, Penn.
 Stealey, Pres. Sydnor L., Southeastern Baptist Seminary, Wake Forest, N. C.

- Stearns, Prof. Raymond P., 202 W. Vermont Ave., Urbana, Ill.
 Steece, Rev. Arvel M., Box 747, Princeton, Minn.
 Steely, Prof. John E., Southern Baptist College, Walnut Ridge, Ark.
 Stewart, Mr. Kenneth, 4835 E. Anaheim, Long Beach 4, Calif.
 Stiansen, Prof. Peter, Northern Baptist Theological Seminary, 3040 W. Washington Blvd.,—Sta. D., Chicago 12, Ill.
 Stockwell, Pres. B. Foster, Camacua 282, Buenos Aires, Argentina, S. A.
 Stoeffler, Dr. F. Ernest, 239 W. Kenilworth Ave., Philadelphia 20, Penn.
 Stoudt, Rev. John J., 218 Nassau Pl., Norristown, Penn.
 Stowe, Rev. Walter H., 184 College Ave., New Brunswick, N. J.
 Strand, Rev. Ahlert H., 4218 Wabansia, Chicago 39, Ill.
 Street, Prof. T. Watson, 108 Laurel Lane, Austin 5, Texas.
 Strub, Rev. Herman, Saint Ambrose College, Davenport, Iowa.
 Suelflow, Rev. August R., 801 De Mun Ave., St. Louis 5, Mo.
 Suffern, Prof. Richard M., Biblical Seminary in New York, 235 E. 49th St., New York 17, N. Y.
 Swann, Rev. Arthur W., 215 Lockwood Ave., Northfield, Ill.
 Sweet, Prof. William W., 2814 Fondren Dr., Dallas 5, Texas.
 Tappert, Dr. Theodore, 7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Penn.
 Taylor, Mr. B. H., c/o First Presbyterian Church, Jefferson City, Tenn.
 Thompson, Prof. Bard, School of Theology, Emory University, Ga.
 Thompson, Prof. Craig R., 729 E. Alton St., Appleton, Wis.
 Thompson, Prof. Ernest T., 1220 Rennie Ave., Richmond 27, Va.
 Thompson, Rev. Thomas K., 261 Chatterton Parkway, White Plains, N. Y.
 Thompson, Prof. W. Ralph, Taylor University, Upland, Ind.
 Thomson, Prof. S. Harrison, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
 Thrift, Prof. Charles T., Florida School of Religion, Lakeland, Fla.
 Tobiasen, Prof. Leif Kr., Southern Missionary College, Collegedale, Tenn.
 Torbet, Prof. Robert G., American Baptist Publication Society, 1703 Chestnut St., Philadelphia 3, Penn.
 Toth, Prof. William, Franklin and Marshall College, Lancaster, Penn.
 Trinterud, Prof. Leonard J., 856 Chalmers Pl., Chicago 14, Ill.
 Troxel, Rev. Daniel C., College of the Bible, Lexington, Ky.
 Tryon, Prof. Harold H., 1123 Spring St., Sharon Hill, Penn.
 Tucker, Rev. Robert L., 20 Park St., Bloomfield, N. J.
 Tufft, Rev. Ernest R., 1720 Oakland Blvd., Walnut Creek, Calif.
 Tufft, Rev. John R., 1201 S. Broadway, Santa Ana, Calif.
 Turner, Prof. Reuben S., Allen University, Columbia, S. C.
 Udy, Rev. James S., Spring St., Moss Vale, New South Wales, Australia.
 Unruh, Prof. John D., Freeman College, Freeman, S. D.
 Van de Vere, Prof. Emmett K., 420 Grove, Berrien Springs, Mich.
 van Dyke, Dean Tertius, 171 Girard Ave., Hartford 5, Conn.
 Van Dyken, Rev. Seymour, Lincoln Ave. at West End Ave., Ridgewood, N. J.
 van Halsema, Rev. Dick L., Box 275, Monsey, N. Y.
 Van Sickle, Prof. Clifton E., 50 Pennsylvania Ave., Delaware, O.
 Van Sickle, Mr. Harold G., Iliff School of Theology, Denver 10, Colo.
 Veneklasen, Prof. James T., c/o Linwood Presbyterian Church, 1801 Linwood Blvd., Kansas City 10, Mo.
 von Rohr, Rev. John R., Pomona College, Claremont, Calif.
 Vose, Rev. Samuel W., Trinity Church, 218 Benton St., Aurora, Ill.
 Vucinich, Mr. Wayne S., 3 Cotton Pl., Menlo Park, Calif.
 Wagoner, Rev. Walter D., Office of the Chaplain, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.
 Walker, Pres. Dean E., Milligan College, Milligan College, Tenn.
 Wallace, Mr. Wilbur T., First Christian Church, Robersonville, N. C.
 Wallenkampf, Mr. Arnold V., Union College, Lincoln 6, Neb.
 Walls, Bishop W. J., 4736 So. Parkway, Chicago 15, Ill.

- Walsh, Prof. Henry H., McGill University, Montreal 2, Quebec, Can.
Walther, Prof. Daniel, 6830 Laurel St., Washington 12, D. C.
Walzer, Dr. William C., 5 Bluebell Court, Garden City, L. I., N. Y.
Warburton, Prof. Stacy R., 2606 Dwight Way, Berkeley 4, Calif.
Ward, Mr. Philip H., 127 W. Symmes St., Norman, Okla.
Washburn, Mr. Henry B., 1 Waterhouse, Cambridge 38, Mass.
Wasson, Rev. Woodrow W., 220 Hull St., Christian College of Religion,
University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.
Watters, Prof. Archibald, 2101 N. Pennsylvania St., Indianapolis, Ind.
Weber, Prof. Bernerd C., Box 315, University, Ala.
Webster, Dr. Hutton, 2025 Cowper St., Palo Alto, Calif.
Weigle, Rev. Luther A., 409 Prospect St., New Haven 11, Conn.
Weinlick, Mr. John R., Moravian Theological Seminary, Bethlehem, Penn.
Welles, Dr. Judith B., Bennett Junior College, Millbrook, N. Y.
Welsh, Rev. Edward B., 15 N. Liberty St., New Concord, O.
Weng, Mr. Armin G. Jr., 1665 Norton Ave., Muskegon, Mich.
Weng, Dean Armin G., 800 S. Clifton Ave., Park Ridge, Ill.
Wenger, Prof. John C., Goshen College Biblical Seminary, Goshen, Ind.
Wentz, Pres. Abdel R., Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Penn.
Wentz, Rev. Frederick K., Lutheran Southern Seminary, Columbia 3, S. C.
Werling, Prof. H. F., 266 Faculty Lane, Seward, Neb.
Wesche, Prof. Percival A., Northwest Nazarene College, Nampa, Idaho.
West, Mr. Earl, 34 N. Layman Ave., Indianapolis 19, Ind.
West, Prof. Robert F., Hillyer Memorial Christian Church, 718 Hillsboro St.,
Raleigh, N. C.
Weswig, Prof. Carl M., 226 S. 2nd St., River Falls, Wis.
White, Mr. Frank F., Jr., Box 164, Flushing, N. Y.
White, Prof. Joseph W., George Pepperdine College, 1121 W. 79th St., Los
Angeles 44, Calif.
Whitney, Mr. Arthur P., Drew Theological Seminary, Madison, N. J.
Whittaker, Pres. Frederick W., 199 Cedar St., Bangor, Me.
Whittle, Mr. Paul D., Jr., 5812 N. Miltimore Ave., Chicago 30, Ill.
Wilbur, Rev. Earl M., 21 Mosswood Rd., Berkeley 4, Calif.
Wilcox, Mr. William G., 26 Park Terrace, Caldwell, N. J.
Wiles, Rev. Charles P., St. Mary's Church, Burlington, N. J.
Williams, Miss Dorothy Ann, 612 E. Polo Dr., St. Louis 5, Mo.
Williams, Prof. George H., 82 Bartlett Ave., Arlington 74, Mass.
Wilson, Mr. Robert S., 602 Golde St., Johnstown, Penn.
Wolbrecht, Prof. Walter F., 210 N. Broadway, St. Louis 2, Mo.
Wolf, Rev. Richard C., Graduate School of Theology, Oberlin College, Oberlin, O.
Woodbridge, Dean Charles J., Fuller Theological Seminary, 135 N. Oakland Ave.,
Pasadena 1, Calif.
Woolley, Rev. Paul, 505 East Willow Grove Ave., Philadelphia 18, Penn.
Wray, Prof. Frank, Box 1992 - Berea College, Berea, Ky.
Wrigley, Mr. John E., 234 Hermitage St., Philadelphia, Penn.
Yates, Prof. Walter L., Hood Theological Seminary, Livingstone College,
Salisbury, N. C.
Yoder, Dr. Don, Valley Forge Rd., Devon, Penn.
Yost, Prof. Frank H., Cedar Lane, Ednor, Md.
Zabriskie, Prof. Alexander C., Virginia Theological Seminary, Alexandria, Va.
Zambus, Prof. James A., Bluefield College, Bluefield, Va.
Ziegler, Rev. Howard J. B., Dept. of Philosophy, Lehigh University, Bethlehem,
Penn.

